

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Vol. XXV

NOVEMBER, 1946

No. 1

OUR AMERICAN MARTYRS: A TRICENTENARY COMMEMORATION

AMERICA'S FIRST TREATY WITH PORTUGAL

William L. Lucey

THE RULE OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Thomas P. Purcell

MOTLEY'S JUSTIFICATION OF PRUSSIANISM

Sr. Claire Lynch

GOTTSCHALK OF ORBAIS

Paul F. Zimmermann

RECENT BOOKS IN REVIEW

25 cents a copy

St. Louis University
St. Louis 3, Mo.

\$1.00 a Year

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XXV

NOVEMBER, 1946

No. 1

Editor: JOHN F. BANNON

Managing Editor: PETER L. DANNER

Business Editor: FRANCIS J. O'BRIEN

Associate Editors

ROBERT V. CALLEN
EDWARD J. STHOKAL
ROBERT H. NEUBECK
BERNARD J. COUGHLIN

WALTER H. HALLORAN
KENNETH J. HERIAN
MARSHALL B. WINKLER
WALTER E. BROWN

Advisory Editors

MARTIN P. HARNEY
THOMAS F. MAHER
CHARLES H. METZGER

W. PATRICK DONNELLY
PETER M. DUNNE
GERALD G. WALSH

Published quarterly in November, January, March, and May by the Missouri Province Educational Institute, St. Louis University, St. Louis 3, Mo. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932 at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on January 20, 1933. Address communications to the Managing Editor or to the Business Editor, *The Historical Bulletin*, 221 North Grand Blvd., St. Louis 3, Mo. *The Historical Bulletin* is indexed in the *Catholic Bookman* and *The Catholic Periodical Index*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AMERICA'S FIRST TREATY WITH PORTUGAL	3
<i>William L. Lucey</i>	
THE RULE OF ST. AUGUSTINE	5
<i>Thomas P. Purcell</i>	
MOTLEY'S JUSTIFICATION OF PRUSSIANISM	7
<i>Sr. Claire Lynch</i>	
GOTTSCHALK OF ORBAIS	9
<i>Paul F. Zimmermann</i>	
OUR AMERICAN MARTYRS	11
<i>Martin F. Hasting</i>	
RECENT BOOKS IN REVIEW	19

CONTRIBUTORS

WILLIAM L. LUCEY, S.J., PH.D., made his doctorate studies at Georgetown University, and is at present Chairman of the Department of History and Political Science at Holy Cross College. He is the author of a recent biography of *Edward Kavanagh* and has been a contributor to the *Catholic Historical Review*, *The New England Quarterly*, *America*, and *The Historical Bulletin*.

THOMAS P. PURCELL, O.S.A., M.A., is at present teaching Augustinian History at Good Counsel Novitiate. He received his Master's degree from Catholic University, and has written several articles on Augustinian History for the *Tagastan*.

SR. CLAIRE LYNCH, O.S.B., PH.D., received her Master's degree from Marquette University and her Doctorate from Catholic University in 1944. She is at present Professor of History at College of St. Benedict.

PAUL F. ZIMMERMANN, C.M., M.A., took his Master's degree from St. Louis University and is on the faculty of the St. Louis Preparatory Seminary.

America's First Treaty with Portugal

William L. Lucey, S. J.

College of the Holy Cross

FEW events in the history of our foreign relations can better indicate the revolutionary rise of the United States to the position of world power than our early diplomatic relations with Portugal. In the many volumes on the history of our foreign relations Portugal is granted, at best, a passing notice; one can ransack the shelves of a library to be rewarded with only a few isolated items of information.¹ Yet despite her insignificant position in the European political world, our statesmen from the first days of independence were intensely interested in Portugal as a good prospect of bolstering the newly acquired political independence with some economic security. Franklin, Jefferson and John Adams, the best of our early diplomats, labored to conclude a commercial treaty with her, but they labored in vain.

Persistently negotiated but repeatedly thwarted, the first treaty with Portugal was ratified only after a wait of sixty-four years. Although the negotiation of this treaty was a minor aspect of our diplomatic relations with the world, the story of the work points out both the weakness of our position during the first two generations of national life and the only recently acquired position of a world power. It is not surprising that many Americans find it difficult to realize that the United States is today a world power; a few generations ago she was a weakling in the community of nations.

As a new born nation our foreign policy was simple: it consisted merely of recognition by the community of nations of our newly acquired status as an independent nation, and of friendly commercial relations with all countries. Even at this time close political ties with Europe had been excluded, despite the fact that we had been compelled to make a military alliance with France in order to win independence. But we had remained economically dependent on Great Britain and would remain so until favorable commercial relations with other nations were established. Portugal, favorably placed on the Atlantic, was a good prospect.

Portugal had become, by that time, a third-class European power. No longer could she proudly boast,

as her national poet Camoens did in his *Lusiad*, that she was the crown, and Spain the head of Europe. Besides, an ancient alliance with England had nearly compelled her to mortgage her national life, for as England gradually became an industrial nation and she remained an agricultural one, it became increasingly clear that reciprocal trade privileges paid dividends only to the industrial partner. With some justification did the world consider the unhappy land of Prince Henry the Navigator and of Vasco da Gama, an English protectorate.

The Portuguese were, of course, dissatisfied with the situation and were eager to lift the mortgage. The old political order appeared to be crumbling, to judge from the success of the revolution of the English colonies in the New World. The Portuguese would take advantage of whatever opportunity came their way from the political disorders; the treaty with Spain in 1777 indicated that they were alert to the situation. Accordingly, whereas most European nations were cold towards the independence movement and indifferent to our proposals for recognition and trade agreements, Portugal became one of the few to take the initiative. In 1783 the Portuguese ambassador at the French court urged Franklin to submit a plan of a treaty which he could submit to his home office; Washington, in 1791, told the Senate that Portugal had "informally, but repeatedly suggested" an exchange of diplomatic representatives.² Appreciating the economic opportunities from a trade agreement with Portugal, our statesmen were eager to secure these advantages and to weaken further the economic power of England. Only the New World would dare to challenge England in her favorite market place. Success there would be a master stroke, and a sure sign that British economic hegemony was on the decline.

The first opportunity to break the British grip on Portuguese trade came in 1783 when the old order was weakened by the successful fight of the English colonies for independence. Benjamin Franklin was in Paris to write the terms of peace. Though he had been authorized by Congress to seek commercial treaties with any European country, he had given little thought to Portugal. Portugal had ordered in 1776 all American ships to leave Portuguese waters within eight days and not until England had consented to the preliminary negotiations for peace had those orders been rescinded.³ Much, then, to

¹ The references to Portugal in three outstanding volumes on diplomatic history indicate the apparent insignificance of our relations with this country. There are no references to Portugal in Richard W. Van Alstyne, *American Diplomacy in Action, A series of Case Studies* (Stanford University Press, 1944); Thomas A. Bailey, *A Diplomatic History of the American People* (3d ed., New York: F. S. Crofts and Company, 1946) has one reference and that one to the acquisition of bases in the Azores in 1943; Samuel F. Bemis, *A Diplomatic History of the United States* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1942) has a number of passing references.

² *American State Papers* (Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1832), I, 127. Message of Washington to Senate, February 18, 1791.

³ M. B. Bonham, "Robert Livingston," in *The American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1927), I, 152-153.

his surprise, Don Vicente de Souza approached him on the subject of a treaty. Portugal, Franklin told Robert R. Livingston, Secretary of the Department of Foreign Affairs, had likewise:⁴

Proposed to treat with us, and the ambassador has earnestly urged me to give him a plan for the consideration of his court, which I have done accordingly, and he has forwarded it. The Congress will send commissions and instructions for concluding these treaties to whom they may think proper; it is only upon the old authority, by a resolution, to myself with Messrs. Deane and Lee, to treat with any European powers, that I have ventured to begin these treaties in consequence of overtures from these crowns.

Although the Portuguese ambassador to France was "extremely desirous of a treaty with our States" delays and obstacles from two different quarters, the Court and Congress, were sufficient to prevent a happy termination of Franklin's efforts. Three months later he wrote:⁵ No answer has yet been given me from the court of Portugal, respecting the plan of a treaty concerted between its ambassador here and me. He has been unwell and much in the country, so that I have not seen him lately. I suspect that the false or exaggerated reports of our government, insidiously propagated throughout Europe by our enemies, have made an impression in that kingdom to our disadvantage, and inclined them to hesitate in forming a connection with us.

But the Congress was as much at fault; for on Christmas Day, 1783, Franklin complained that "our treaties with Denmark and Portugal remain unfinished, for want of instructions respecting them from Congress, and a commission empowering some minister to conclude them." The exaggerated stories about the internal weaknesses of the new United States, which were in circulation in the European courts, were not without some foundation. Two years later he had despaired of ever getting any action from Congress. The treaty with Portugal which needed "only the fiat of Congress, seem[ed] now to be going backward."⁶ Franklin decided to return to America.

In 1785 Thomas Jefferson succeeded Franklin as minister to France, and Congress commissioned him and John Adams, minister to the Court of St. James', to negotiate commercial treaties with European nations. A trade agreement with Portugal was one of their early objectives. Jefferson, the agrarian, considered our trade with Portugal very important, perhaps the most important of all our European trade relations, and hence in his mind a trade agreement with her was an indispensable element of United States commercial relations. "Our commerce," he told Monroe, "with that country is very important; perhaps more so than with any other country in Europe." When he found the Portuguese ambassador in Paris "lethargic" on the matter, he asked if it would "not be prudent to send a minister to Portugal?"⁷

Instead, negotiations were transferred to London under the directions of Adams and Luiz Pinto de Souza, the Portuguese ambassador in that city. In the fall of

1785 Adams sent him a rough draft of a treaty for his consideration. He was extremely happy to discover that:⁸ Portugal is stepping forward in the business of a treaty, and that there is a probability that we may at length do something under our commissions, which may produce a solid benefit to our constituents.

He agreed with the main points of the draft and so restricted himself to only four pages of recommendations. Flour, iron, salt, cotton, wool, sugar, chocolate, ginseng and East Indian products received his comments. Portugal must admit American flour in place of the grain; for under such an arrangement the enormous loss of wheat from the weevil and the heat of vessel's hold would be avoided and the Portuguese consumers, who paid for these losses, would have a cheaper flour. Wine was an important article; aware of the drinking capacity of the American he foresaw the not too distant day when all Portugal would not be able to satisfy the demands of this country. Adams was advised to strive for trading privileges with Brazil, and, if it was impossible to obtain these, to insist that the Azores, Madeiras and Cape de Verde islands be considered part of continental Portugal.

In the spring of 1786 Jefferson crossed the channel to settle the final terms of the treaty with Adams and de Pinto. The latter's illness kept him there longer than he had expected, but the treaty was ready for signature April 25. The only article that offered any difficulty was:⁹ a stipulation that our bread stuff should be received in Portugal, in the form of flour as well as of grain. He [de Souza] approved of it himself, but observed that several Nobles, of great influence at their court, were the owners of windmills in the neighbourhood of Lisbon, which depended much for their profits on manufacturing our wheat, and that this stipulation would endanger the whole treaty. He signed it, however, . . .

The warning was sound enough, for the opposition of this group was sufficient, according to Jefferson, to defeat the treaty. Other factors, among them the attitude of England, undoubtedly entered into its rejection by Portugal. But during the few years following the Portuguese-Spanish treaty of 1777, Portugal did enjoy some economic freedom, as these negotiations in London indicate. Jefferson returned to the United States to conduct foreign affairs in Washington's administration without the "very important" commercial treaty with Portugal.

Back in America and in control of the State Department, Jefferson was in position to pursue the greatly desired but elusive trade agreement. The first step was a formal recognition of the United States by an exchange of diplomats. The many negotiations between official representatives of the two nations were, of course, the equivalent of recognition, but an exchange of resident diplomats would make it formal and also would facilitate the resumption of talks on a treaty.

Portugal had frequently suggested the desirability of resident diplomatic representatives. George Washington was quite willing to act, but for reasons of economy wanted to send a diplomat of the lowest grade,—a chargé d'affaires. Portugal, however, retained some of her former pride even though she had lost her former position of a great commercial nation; the Queen would not consider receiving a diplomat of this rank, since it was "of little

(Please turn to page twelve)

⁴ *The Works of Benjamin Franklin*, ed. by Jared Sparks (Boston: Hilliard, Gray and Co., 1840), IX, 524-525, under date of June 12, 1783, Paris.

⁵ *Ibid.*, X, 16-17, Franklin to the President of Congress, September 13, 1783. See also letters of November 1, 1783, *ibid.*, X, 29.

⁶ Letter to Congress, December 25, 1783, *ibid.*, X, 39 and letter to John Jay, February 8, 1785, *ibid.*, X, 156-157.

⁷ Thomas Jefferson to James Monroe, Paris, August 28, 1785, *Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. by H. A. Washington (New York: Derby & Jackson, 1859), I, 406. See also letter to John Jay, October 11, 1785, *ibid.*, I, 458-459, which also stresses the importance of a treaty with Portugal.

⁸ Jefferson to John Adams, October 11, 1785, *ibid.*, I, 492-496.

⁹ Jefferson's *Autobiography*, *ibid.*, I, 64.

The Rule of St. Augustine

Thomas P. Purcell, O. S. A.

Good Counsel Novitiate

THE influence of Saint Augustine on the Christian civilization in the West has been the topic of countless dissertations. The mind of the great Bishop of Hippo penetrated almost every field of theology; his many sermons show us Augustine as the tireless shepherd of souls; the classic *City of God* written between the year 413-426 would have been sufficient of itself to place the name of the Doctor of Grace among the immortals of mankind. But we are interested in only one phase of the work of the "Hammer of Heretics"—the legislation he has bequeathed us on the monastic life. More than sixty communities today follow what is called the *Rule of Saint Augustine*; among whom we may mention the various Orders of Saint Augustine, the Dominicans, the Norbertines, the Servites, the Trinitarians, the Marists, the Alexian Brothers, the Nuns of the Visitation, the School Sisters of Notre Dame, and many others. The Rule of Saint Augustine, along with the Rules of Saint Basil, Saint Benedict, and Saint Francis, has been counted as one of the four great Rules in the Church.

For the past 700 years there have been various opinions held on the Rule of Saint Augustine. There are those who say that Saint Augustine never wrote any Rule; others will say that he never wrote a Rule for men, but merely set down norms for a community of women as we have it in his Letter 211. In recent years the tide of opinion has begun to change, and scholars now maintain that Saint Augustine wrote his Rule for a community of men. An enlightening and logical treatment of the subject was given by Fr. Pierre Mandonnet, O.P., in his *Saint Dominique*.¹ Fr. Nicholas Merlin, O.S.A., gave his solution to the problem in a neat and interesting work published in 1933, *Saint Augustin et la Vie Monastique*.² Fr. Winfrid Huempfer, O.S.A., presented his view on the subject in the introduction to the critical edition of the *Vitas fratrum Jordani de Saxonia*³ published in 1943. We shall present our discussion on the subject under various headings, basing our opinions on the above mentioned works.

I. Saint Augustine's Monastic Life

The dynamic character and personality of Saint Augustine and his love for companionship made it only natural that after his conversion to the Catholic Faith, he gathered followers about himself. Before his conversion Augustine loved to love and to be loved, merely for love's sake,⁴ but after his Baptism the love of his great

heart soared heavenward and carried with it the hearts of his companions also. From the very first moment that the Tagastan heard of Saint Anthony and the lives of the Egyptian monks, his heart yearned after that type of life. In fact, some are wont to call his retreat at Cassiciacum in the suburbs of Milan, before his baptism, Augustine's first monastic experiment.⁵

It was upon his return to his native land in 388 that Saint Augustine actually instituted his brotherhood. "We kept together" the Saint says in his *Confessions*, "intending to still dwell together according to our holy resolve, and seeking some place where we might serve Thee more conveniently, we journeyed back to Africa together."⁶ Saint Possidius, a disciple of Saint Augustine and his first biographer, speaking of the first Augustinian monastery established by his spiritual father writes: "... and in God's grace it pleased him to return to his parental home (at Tagaste) and possessions, together with his friends. Having settled there for almost three years after his arrival (388-391), and having put aside all worldly cares, together with those adhering to him, he was living for God in fastings, prayers and good works, and day and night was meditating on the law of the Lord."⁷

In 391 Augustine tells us that he went from Tagaste to Hippo for the purpose of winning an acquaintance to the service of God in his monastery. While there he was prevailed upon to be ordained a priest and was subsequently consecrated a bishop. And, says Augustine, "Because I proposed to live in a monastery with my brethren, ... the elderly Valerius [Bishop of Hippo] gave me the garden in which my monastery now stands. I assembled there upright brethren who possessed nothing as I possessed nothing. As I practiced poverty and sold what I had and gave to the poor and begged, so they did and desired thus to do, that we might live in common: for God Himself is common to us as our great and most rich reward."⁸

This monastery in the garden adjoining the episcopal palace was Augustine's second monastery. When he became bishop, Augustine founded his third monastery, as he tells us: "... I was raised to the episcopate and ... I desired to have in my episcopal house a monastery of clerics ... behold how we live, no one in our Society is permitted to have anything his own."⁹ Thus we see from Augustine's own words that he himself set up at least three different monasteries.

II. An Augustinian Rule at Tagaste?

It seems almost impossible that Saint Augustine could have gathered his communities together at Tagaste and Hippo without setting up some norm or rule of life to follow. How incredible it would seem to us today if a group of men got together to form a religious community and yet had no common rule to bind them into a unit—and this incredibility seems all the greater when we know

¹ Pierre Mandonnet, O.P., *Saint Dominique. L'Idée, l'Homme et l'Oeuvre*, 2 vols., Paris, 1937. English translation: *Saint Dominic and his work*, translated by Sister Mary Benedicta Larkin, O.P., B. Herder Book Co., Saint Louis, Mo., 1944.

² Jordan of Saxony, O.S.A., *Vitas fratrum*, new critical edition by Fr. Rudolph Arbesmann, O.S.A., and Fr. Winfrid Huempfer, O.S.A., Cosmopolitan Science and Art Service, New York, 1943.

³ Nicholas Merlin, O.S.A., *Saint Augustin et la Vie Monastique*, Albi, 1933. English translation, still in manuscript form, *Saint Augustine and the Monastic Life*, translated by Fr. Joseph Gildea, O.S.A.

⁴ *Conf.* III, 1, 1.

⁵ N. Merlin, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

⁶ *Conf.* IX, 8.

⁷ Saint Possidius, *Vita Sancti Augustini*, ch. 3, P.L. XXXII, 36.

⁸ *Sermo* 355, P.L. XXXVIII, 1569-70.

⁹ *Ibid.*

that the father of those African brotherhoods was Saint Augustine. In fact, there seems to be something inherent in the nature of man, that when a group comes together to form a fraternity or society, the first thing that comes to mind is the formation of some kind of by-laws to help the group attain the end for which it is organizing. Saint Possidius, writing apropos to this point, says:

Soon after he [Augustine] was ordained a priest he established a monastery with the approval of the Church, and with servants of God he began to live according to the manner and rule instituted by the Holy Apostles. And in that society no one in particular possessed anything of his own. All things were held in common and were distributed to each according to his needs. He had already been living according to this rule since his return to his land from beyond the seas.¹⁰

It may be argued that what Saint Possidius says about Augustine living "according to rule" merely refers to the common life mentioned in the *Acts of the Apostles* (iv, 32/35). But why should he mention rule at all when referring to the apostolic life, for we never refer to the early Christians as bound by rule to the common life (—in fact, Saint Peter reminded Ananias that it was not imposed by rule)? Here, no doubt, Possidius was referring to the religious rule of his holy father.¹¹ To argue that Saint Augustine had no Rule for his three communities would be to argue against practical experience and usage. The problem for us then, is to determine what rule Augustine gave his communities.

III. Looking into the manuscripts.

Our first point in digging back into history for Saint Augustine's rule might be to determine what is the oldest manuscript which would tend to prove that the Bishop of Hippo wrote a rule for his brethren? The ages have dealt kindly with us in this regard, for the oldest manuscript of the Rule of Saint Augustine, the so-called "Corbiensis," takes us back almost to the time of the Doctor of Grace. Fr. A. Casamasa, O.S.A., one of the foremost authorities on Augustinology today, described the vicissitudes of this ancient parchment manuscript in a report made before the Roman Academy of Archeology in 1923: this precious document was in the library of the monastery at Corbie until 1638, when it passed to the Abbey of Saint Germain des Pres—it remained in the latter abbey until the French Revolution, and today it can be found among the Latin codices in the Bibl. National in Paris, number 12634.¹² This ancient manuscript is dated by the experts as coming from the period 500-750. Moreover, Dom Morin, O.S.B., notes that the first part of Rule contained in the "Corbiensis," independently of this manuscript, can be dated as composed about the year 440¹³ when studied from internal evidence; this evidence brings its composition within ten years of Saint Augustine's lifetime. There are also other manuscripts still extant, dated by experts as coming from the 9th, 10th and 11th centuries. Almost without fail all these manuscripts have as their "explicit"—a term used from Roman times to set off the title of a work and the name of the author—"Explicit Regula Sancti Augustini." These ancient manuscripts should be

an everlasting proof against those who say that the Rule of Saint Augustine was an invention of the 12th century.

IV. The *Disciplina Monasterii*

In the manuscript "Corbiensis" and in all manuscripts of the Rule up to the 12th century we find a text quite different in extent from the Rule of Saint Augustine as we know it today. In the most ancient manuscripts the Rule of Saint Augustine begins as follows:¹⁴

1. Let God be loved above all things, dearest brethren, and then our neighbor, because these are the principal commands given to us.
 2. This is how we ought to pray or say the psalms. In the morning three psalms should be said: the 62nd, the 5th and the 89th; at Terce let a psalm be said with a responsory, then two antiphons, a lesson and a concluding prayer; in like manner at Sext and None; at evening, moreover, one responsory psalm, four antiphons, again one responsory psalm, a lesson and a concluding prayer. And at a convenient time after the evening exercise, all being seated, the lessons may be read; moreover, let the customary psalms be recited before retiring. Night prayers for the months of November, December, January, February, 12 antiphons, 6 psalms, 3 lessons; for March, April, September and October, 10 antiphons, 5 psalms, 3 lessons; for May, June, July and August, 8 antiphons, 4 psalms and 2 lessons.
 3. Let them (the brethren) work from morning to the hour of Sext; and from Sext to the hour of None they may be free for reading; and at None they may return books; and after they have eaten they may work again in the garden, or whatever it may be necessary, until evening.
 4. Let no one do anything for himself alone, whether for clothing or for anything else; for we desire to live the apostolic life.
 5. Let no one do anything with murmuring, lest he perish by a judgment like that of the murmurers.
 6. Let them obey with fidelity, honor their father after God, and respect their superior as becomes the holy.
 7. Seated at the table let them be silent to listen to the reading. If, moreover, any need shall arise, their superior shall see to it. On Saturday and Sunday, as is the custom, those who wish may have wine.
 8. If there be any need to go out of the monastery for any purpose, let two go. No one may eat or drink out of the monastery without permission, for this is not in accord with monastic discipline. If the brethren are commissioned to sell any of the goods of the monastery, let them be careful to do nothing contrary to the law, knowing that they may offend God in His servants. If they are buying something for the monastery, let them discharge the business carefully and faithfully as servants of God.
 9. Let there be no idle word; let them be about their own work from the morning; similarly, after the prayers of Terce, let them go to their own work; they should not stand about talking, unless perchance, it may be for the good of the spirit. Let them sit in silence at their duties, unless perchance the necessity of the work require that something be said.
 10. If anyone shall not have tried to fulfill these things in all virtue, with the help of God, and shall have disregarded them with a stubborn spirit, and if, having been admonished once and again he shall not amend, let him know that he must subject himself as is proper to the monastic discipline. Moreover, if his age admits of it, he may be punished. Observing these things faithfully and piously in the name of Christ, you will profit and your joy will be great in your salvation. Amen.
- These are the things which we command you who are assembled in the monastery to observe.
The first purpose for which you have been gathered together . . . etc. (as in the Rule of Saint Augustine as we have it today).

Father Mandonnet has called these first ten prescriptions of the Rule of Saint Augustine the *Disciplina Monasterii* from the fact that the words "monastic discipline" is mentioned several times in the text. Immediately following the text of the *Disciplina* we read in the "Corbiensis"

(Please turn to page fourteen)

¹⁴ As in Mandonnet, *op. cit.*, 219-21.

¹⁰ Saint Possidius, *op. cit.*, ch. 5.

¹¹ N. Merlin, *op. cit.*, 24.

¹² *Ibid.*, 21.

¹³ Dom Germanus Morin, O.S.B., "L'ordre des heures canonicales," *Revue Bénédictine*, XLIII (1931), 145-52.

Motley's Justification of Prussianism

Sr. Claire Lynch, O. S. B.

College of St. Benedict

THERE is at present much controversy as to whether or not the entire German nation has been impregnated by "Prussianism." John Lothrop Motley, a New England literary historian of the mid-nineteenth century, had an intimate knowledge of this Prussian spirit during the years of its greatest development, that period, namely, during which Bismarck was at the helm of the Prussian state. His views should be of interest to the modern reader.

At the completion of his work at Harvard in 1831 Motley, like many of his American contemporaries, went to North Germany to continue his studies, first at the University of Goettingen and then at Berlin. It may be assumed that these years of study in Germany (1832-1834) were significant in his intellectual development because of the important movements developing at that time in German universities. Unfortunately, from the sources available one learns very little of the impressions made upon him by these intellectual trends or by their representatives.¹ However it does seem legitimate to attribute to the German school of historians many of the ideas found in Motley's political theorizing of contemporary European affairs.

It was during these university days that Motley formed an intimate friendship with Bismarck, one that was to endure for some forty years. These two men differing widely as they did on political views always spoke of and to each other in terms of deep affection and great esteem.²

In 1855, after a lapse of some twenty years, Motley visited Bismarck in Frankfort. In describing this visit to his wife Motley showed how ardently he admired his Prussian friend of university days.

I find that I like him even better than I thought I did and you know how high an opinion I always expressed of his talents and dispositions. He is a man of very noble character, and of very great powers of mind. . . . Strict integrity and courage of character, with a high sense of honor, a firm religious belief, united with remarkable talents, make up necessarily a combination which cannot be found any day in any court. . . . Of course, my politics are very different from his, although not so antipodal

¹ There is no adequate biography of Motley. A brief account of his life may be found in the memoir by O. W. Holmes, *John Lothrop Motley, A Memoir* (Boston, 1879). Three volumes of Motley's correspondence have been published cf. Vol. I of *Correspondence of John Lothrop Motley*, edited by G. W. Curtis (New York, 1889), hereafter cited as *Correspondence*. In these letters written to his parents from Germany, there is only a casual reference to his scholarly professors like Benecki, Hugo and Savigny. Cf. G. Geoch, *History and Historians of the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1913), pp. 14-129, for a discussion of the intellectual trends of this period. Also F. Engel Janosi, *The Growth of German Historicism* (Baltimore, 1944).

² Motley returned to Boston in 1835. In 1841 he served for a few months as secretary of the United States legation at St. Petersburg. Returning to the United States, he spent the next nine years in literary activities for periodicals such as the *North American Review*, and he did some preliminary work on *The Rise of the Dutch Republic*. To gather further material for this study, he went to Europe in 1841. With the exception of short visits to the United States, Motley spent the remainder of his life in England and Europe. He was the United States Minister to Austria from 1861 to 1867 and to England from 1869 to 1870.

as you might suppose, but I can talk with him as frankly as I could with you, and I am glad of the opportunity of hearing the other side put by a man whose talents and character I esteem and who so well knows *le dessous des cartes*.³

Friendly correspondence and visits, though infrequent, continued throughout the lives of these two men. It is known that they visited each other four times between the dates 1855 and 1872, and twenty-six letters of their correspondence are extant.⁴

In striking contrast to the vivid accounts of the intellectual and social life found in his letters from England, Motley's letters from Vienna are concerned almost entirely with political affairs. While American writers of the nineteenth century showed a distinct bias for the protestant European countries and likewise a tendency to identify absolutism and tyranny with catholicism,⁵ there is, however, no evidence of unfairness due to religious bigotry to be found in Motley's interpretation of Austrian affairs in his correspondence and despatches from Austria during the period of his diplomatic mission to the country.⁶ Still Motley failed to give any attention to the Creed and institutions of Catholic Austria. This unwarranted omission is but partially explained by his tendency to superficial observation. Is it perhaps expecting too much of an American so thoroughly convinced of the superiority of the Protestant civilization of North Germany, to show any recognition of the fact that the Catholic religion was an integral part of Austria's culture?

Motley felt that he knew Bismarck. In his first confidential letter from Vienna to Seward, then secretary of state, he characterized the Prussian chancellor as being "remarkable for talent, character, courage and a most determined reactionary, a fervent legitimist, a hater of revolution and democracy." He added in a somewhat boastful manner that probably "no man in the world knows him more intimately than I do." Probably to dispel any fears in Seward's mind, that he might be unduly influenced by his Prussian friend, Motley told about their university days, saying, "You may suppose that my early friend and myself had but small sympathy with each other's political views, but the ties of youthful friendship were so strong and the spheres of American and European politics so distinct that it was easier for us to agree to disagree than it would be under any other imaginable circumstance."⁷

In Motley's discussion of German affairs one finds him often reiterating that Bismarck was the leader of the

³ Motley to his wife, July 27, 1855, *Correspondence*, I, 174.

⁴ Their last meeting was in 1872 in Varzin where Motley went to visit Bismarck.

⁵ For an account of American opinion of German unification cf. J. G. Gazley, *American Opinion of German Unification 1848-1871* (New York, 1926), pp. 110, 121, 194-198, 514.

⁶ Cf. *The Diplomatic Mission of John Lothrop Motley to Austria 1861-1867* (Catholic University, 1944).

⁷ Motley to Seward, Confidential Report, June 25, 1862. Austria Despatches National Archives, Washington, hereafter cited as N.A.

absolute Prussian state, and a man with no faith in the liberal element in Germany. In 1863 he wrote, "While I am a great Liberal myself, I believe that Prussia is by the necessary condition of its existence a military monarchy and when it ceases to be that it is nothing."⁸ Today when so much is being written about the evils of Prussian aggressive militarism, it is somewhat startling to find Motley justifying it as a sort of "historical necessity" in typical Hegelian style.

This notion of "historical necessity" is reflected again in his observation of Bismarck's aggressiveness during the Danish war of 1864 when the seed was planted for the inevitable struggle between Austria and Prussia for supremacy in Germany affairs. Motley concluded then that "Prussia would seem by the law of her existence to be an aggressive Military Monarchy. By obeying that law she became a great European power; and perhaps the same conduct may lead her to still greater aggrandizement."⁹ Some two years later on the eve of the Austrian-Prussian War, he reflects that "the moment seems to have arrived in the opinion of those who are guiding Prussia for asserting the necessity of aggrandizement of that kingdom and making the long cherished dream of supremacy in Germany a fact."¹⁰

In spite of what appears to be a sympathetic attitude with Prussianism in Motley, one should not conclude that he was a prejudicial observer in Austria's struggle for her position of primacy. He tried to be fair, and even sympathized with the Hapsburgs, saying, "If there were ever a power in the world which most earnestly desired peace and was determined to attack nobody unless compelled to do so it is Austria. Yet she is accused on one side by Prussia (determined to get Schleswig-Holstein) and by Italy on the other (determined to get Venice) of bloodthirsty intentions. . . . Her position of wolf between these two lamb-like adversaries is altogether unparalleled in history."¹¹

While he admitted that the lamb-like adversary on the north was a military despot, still he had hopes for a liberal as well as powerful Germany after the geographical obstacles were cleared away by Bismarck, the hard cutting instrument. Motley perceived Bismarck as representing the real spirit of the whole Prussian people, saying, "But there is a future—a possible future for Prussia. It may one day become liberal as well as powerful. Intellectually and industrially it is by far the leading power in Germany. Constitutionally it may become free. It is now a military despotism. . . . Bismarck is a man of great talent and iron will. . . . He represents what is the real tendency and instinct of the whole Prussian people. . . . They all want a Great Prussia."¹²

And what was this instinct of the Prussian people? Motley thought it was basically a democratic force. "If Prussia continued to be an aggressive absolute state, popular revolution would soon reveal that national, there-

fore democratic principles lay at the bottom of her recent prodigious success."¹³

To this indomitable power of democracy he attributed the success of 1866 and not to the superior military forces nor the skillful diplomacy of the Prussians. Motley believed that "The Teutonic minds all over the country were deeply conscious that the miraculous success of Prussia was not due to her needle guns nor her admirable organization, nor even the genius of Bismarck but to her democratic principle." Thus he condones the "Prussian way," saying that probably "Prussian military despotism was doing more for liberty than did Kossuth, Garibaldi or Mazzini."¹⁴

Today, while we reject entirely Motley's identification of the democratic principle with Prussian aggressive militarism, we must admit that this American diplomat did have a clear vision of the basic issue underlying the conflict between Prussia and Austria. To him it was clearly a struggle for hegemony in Germany, though he failed to see the inevitable consequence of unifying Germany by the "Prussian Method."

This desire for unification, he thought, was essentially the principle of liberty and freedom. "If Germany became one," he said at the close of the Austrian-Prussian war, "she would probably become ultimately free, whether called Empire or Republic." It was this inevitable force, democracy, and not the individual that really directed events, ". . . William I of Germany and Hohenzollern has about as much idea of the work he is probably doing as Sherman's horse had of the Georgia campaign."¹⁵

As a further explanation of this inevitable force, he declared that it was possible to discover a law governing the apparent chaotic and tangled scheme of human affairs. "This law is progress—slow, confused, contradictory, but ceaseless development, intellectual and moral of the human race. . . . The law is progress; the result Democracy."¹⁶

Was it his infatuation with his hero, Bismarck, or a blind worship of German civilization in general, or the influence of the German school of "historical success" that explains Motley's dogmatic proclamation that progress and liberty are identical? This newly formed progressive military state had eventually to become a democracy; for, he said, "It is impossible that the success of Prussia is to end in the establishment of one great Military empire and no more. The great statesman of Prussia is distinguished for courage, insight, breadth of vision, iron will and a warm and a steadfast heart. His genius consists in the instinctive power of governing by conforming to the spirit of the age. No man knows better than Bismarck, to read the signs of the times."¹⁷

As American minister in London in 1870 Motley carefully followed the progress of the Franco-Prussian War and dutifully sent his reflections to Seward. The military

(Please turn to page sixteen)

⁸ Motley to Lady William Russell, May 31, 1863, *John Lothrop Motley and his Family* (London, 1910), pp. 178-179, edited by his daughter and Herbert St. John Mildmay, hereafter cited as *Mildmay*.

⁹ Motley to Seward, No. 71. August 14, 1864. N.A.

¹⁰ Motley to Seward, No. 157. April 1, 1866. N.A.

¹¹ Motley to Seward, No. 168. May 1, 1866. N.A.

¹² Motley to his daughter, June 29, 1866, *Correspondence*, II, 220-224.

¹³ Motley to Seward, No. 201. August 1, 1866. N.A.

¹⁴ Motley to Lily, August 7, 1866, *Correspondence*, II, 241-242.

¹⁵ Motley to Lily, August 7, 1866, *Correspondence*, II, 241-242.

¹⁶ An address given to the New York Historical Society, and published as *Historic Progress and American Democracy* (New York, 1869).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 39-41.

Gottschalk of Orbais

Paul F. Zimmermann, C. M.

St. Louis Preparatory Seminary

THE sole fact which will continue to keep alive the interest of the historian in Gottschalk is that he was responsible for the greatest theological dispute of the ninth century—the Predestination controversy. And yet, a detailed study of his intriguing and tragic life, in addition to revealing a more thorough knowledge of the controversy, does, in itself, form a very absorbing historical study.

We do not know the exact year in which Gottschalk was born. Certainly it must not have been long after the year 804—the year Charlemagne had finally and completely subdued Gottschalk's native land of Saxony.¹ It is even possible that his father had been among the Saxon nobles who had stoutly opposed the encroachments of Charlemagne but who, upon submitting, were named to important positions. Of this we are sure: Gottschalk's father did hold the important political office of Count.²

Following the example of other noblemen, Count Bernus offered his son as an oblate to the great Benedictine monastery of Fulda. After receiving the usual training of such oblates, Gottschalk took the vows of a monk.

The transition from oblate to monk was normally a matter of course. Two commentaries on the Rule,³ which date back to these times, regarded promises made by parents as final, and with as much binding force as promises made by one of legal age. As Dom Knowles points out,⁴ such an engagement was similar to the promises made by parents for their children at Baptism and he adds:

Like the similar engagements of infant marriage and vicariously dedicated virginity such a disposal of a child's future was in perfect accord with the outlook of the time, and, indeed, with the manners and circumstances of European society throughout the first half of the Middle Ages.

Rabanus Maurus, who became abbot in 822, evidently tried to follow out this usual procedure, but he found opposition from Gottschalk. In the fragments of certain letters of Fulda, preserved by Duemmler,⁵ we learn that Gottschalk "asserted that although unwilling, he had been tonsured and violently given over to the monastic life" by Rabanus Maurus.

In spite of the general opinion that child oblations were final and irrevocable, there were some who called the practice into question.⁶ Gottschalk took advantage

of this minority opposition and entered upon the first of the many disputes of his life. The case was tried by a very distinguished group of archbishops and bishops in a synodal council held at Mainz in 829. After discussing the case diligently, the council decided to free Gottschalk from the obligations of his vows.

Rabanus Maurus, however, was not defeated by the decision of the council. He appealed to the emperor for a review of the case. Just when and where this second trial took place is not known; even the details of the trial are lacking. Whatever the decisions were, the principal decision of the synod was reversed, or at any rate, Gottschalk did remain a monk and subject to his vows.⁷

Gottschalk then left Fulda and, for reasons which we do not know, went to the Benedictine monastery of Orbais in the diocese of Soissons. The ten years spent at Orbais were relatively quiet days: days of study, days when Gottschalk learned the art of poetry and learned it well,⁸ days when he brought his theological opinions more sharply into focus. The closing days, however, brought a very disturbing factor to these otherwise tranquil years. Gottschalk received Holy Orders at the hands of the chorepiscopus Rigbald.

Due to the peculiar status of chorepiscopi at that time, his Orders, to say the least, were doubtfully valid. This can be ascertained from a short resume of the history of chorepiscopi in the West.⁹ Unlike the East, chorepiscopi are of a very late origin in the West. True, in the early days, there were some bishops of country places, but there was no distinction between these and urban bishops. The term, chorepiscopus, is itself of late use, not becoming common until the early eighth century. It is very exceptional to find St. Boniface giving full episcopal powers to the two chorepiscopi whom he consecrated in 755 to assist the bishop of Utrecht. Usually their powers were limited.

Early in the ninth century Charlemagne launched upon a campaign to relegate chorepiscopi to a place of unimportance, if not actually to eliminate them entirely. Not only did he pass stringent disciplinary measures, making them entirely subject to the bishop in whose diocese they dwelled, but he went so far as to pass sentence of radical nullity against the episcopal acts of chorepiscopi. He prescribed that the sacraments received from chorepiscopi were to be conferred purely

¹ Gottschalk proudly insists that he is a subject of the Saxon, not Frankish laws. Cf. Rabanus Maurus, *Liber de Oblatione Puerorum*, edited by Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae*, CVII, 431.

² Cf. "Epistolarum Fuldensium Fragmenta ex Octava, Nona et Decima Centuriis Ecclesiasticae Historiae," edited by E. Duemmler, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, III, 829.

³ The two commentaries here referred to are: (1) the one written by Paul the Deacon about the year 770; and (2) a second written by the monk Hildemar, who was for some time a monk of the Franklands. Cf. Schroll, *Benedictine Monasticism*, pp. 21, 24, 25.

⁴ Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England*, 417.

⁵ *Loc. cit.*, 528-529. The quotation is taken from a section entitled "Epistolarum Fuldensium Fragmenta."

⁶ For a thorough treatment of the dispute about child oblations, cf. H. Leclercq, "Oblat," *Dictionnaire d'archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, XII, 1861-1863.

⁷ E. Traube, "Carmina," *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Poetae Latini Aevi*, III, 709, gives an outline of the events of these early years of Gottschalk.

⁸ Traube has edited seven of these poems. *loc. cit.* 724-738. Laistner, *Thought and Letters in Western Europe, A.D. 500-900*, p. 287, gives a favorable opinion of the worth of these poems.

⁹ The source for information on chorepiscopi was, principally, Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles d'après les Documents Originaux*, II Appendix I, 1230-1237.

and simply over again and not conditionally. He declared that the chorepiscopi were to be consecrated by one bishop only, the first guarantee of their episcopal incapacity. To corroborate this decision of his, he appealed to a council of Ratisbonne; the text of this appeal we do not possess. Succeeding years saw successive documents which took from chorepiscopi still other episcopal rights.

In 853 Hincmar of Reims sent a question to Pope Leo IV asking him just how he was to regard the cases of the faithful who had been confirmed and of clerics ordained by chorepiscopi. This concerned the chorepiscopus Rigbald in particular, for he had administered the see of Reims just previous to the arrival of Hincmar. Unfortunately we do not have the reply of the pope.

This brief general story of chorepiscopi will forestall any surprise at the condition placed in the following sentence passed against Gottschalk at the council of Kiersy in 850:

Brother Gottschalk, the most holy office of the sacerdotal mystery, which you have irregularly usurped . . . if in some way you have received (it), has been taken away and, lest you presume to enjoy it further, has been perpetually interdicted . . .¹⁰

But the real disturbing factor was that he had received these Orders without the knowledge of his proper Ordinary at Soisson and contrary to the Benedictine Rule which required that the abbot select the candidates whom he thought fit to receive Holy Orders. Gottschalk could scarcely hope to remain at Orbais in peace after such an action.

And so the peaceful decade at Orbais (829-839) gave way to a very restless decade (839-849). We see Gottschalk journeying first to Rome, then to Friuli, where he spent a protracted visit as guest of Count Eberhardt. It was there that Gottschalk met Noting, the bishop-elect of Brescia. Gottschalk discussed his theories on Predestination with Noting, no doubt, with the hope of winning him over to his views. Noting, however, sought the advice of Rabanus Maurus. Rabanus then wrote two letters¹¹ condemning Gottschalk of teaching double predestination. The first letter was to be used in confuting the errors of Gottschalk. The second letter however, is more specific as to the teachings of Gottschalk. In it, Rabanus Maurus accuses him of teaching the following:

The predestination of God so constrains all men that even if one wished to save himself and struggles having the true faith and with good works that he might arrive at eternal life through the grace of God, he labors in vain and uselessly, if he has not been predestined to life, as if God forces a man to perish by his predestination. He Who is the author of our salvation.¹²

This, Rabanus says, has led many to despair, saying:

Why is it necessary for me to work for my salvation and for eternal life? Since, if I shall have done good and have not been predestined to life, it is of no avail to me; if, however, I shall have done evil, nothing stands in the way since the predestination of God shall make me arrive at eternal life.¹³

According to Rabanus Maurus, then, the followers of Gottschalk were led to accept the ultimate conclusions of absolute predestination: they abandoned the practice of good works; for, since they were predestined to heaven

or to hell, these good works availed them nothing. A very conservative conclusion from this is that Gottschalk worded his teachings in such a way that, whether he intended it or not, many were led into heresy.

It was, no doubt, as a result of the advice given to Count Eberhardt in the second of the above mentioned letters that Gottschalk was forced to leave Friuli in 846. Gottschalk continued his teachings, however, wandering among the barbarous peoples to the east of Friuli, winning the admiration of the Croatian king, Tripimir.¹⁴ He then returned to Fulda in 849, perhaps not so much to return to that monastery as to visit an old friend of his, Hatto, who had succeeded Rabanus as abbot in 849.

The year 849 was to see dark days descend upon Gottschalk, days that were never again to brighten. He was summoned to appear before a synodal council of Mainz. He does not seem to have objected for he hoped, no doubt, to confute Rabanus Maurus, who had become archbishop of Mainz in 849 and who presided over the synodal council. For, certainly, one thing we can say about Gottschalk: he does seem to have been absolutely convinced of the truth of what he taught. The council condemned him and sent him to Hincmar, archbishop of Reims. A second council, held at Kiersy under the supervision of Hincmar, also condemned him and provided that he be confined as prisoner at the Benedictine monastery of Hautvillers.

Life at Hautvillers must certainly have been far from pleasing to Gottschalk, but it does not seem to have been too severe. Hincmar, writing to archbishop Egilo who was about to visit Rome, says that if anyone asked Egilo what the treatment of Gottschalk was like, he should tell them that he receives his food and drink regularly each day, that clothing is offered to him, that wood, fire and a hearth are provided in the house in which he is detained.¹⁵

But in the same letter, we learn that Gottschalk did not correspond to this good treatment. He refused to wash "not only his body but even his hands and face," no doubt to make himself unbearable. In another letter Hincmar reports that he would not clothe himself. He refused to accept clothing from brethren who had communication with Hincmar, and he did not have sufficient money to buy clothes elsewhere. As a consequence "he went about just as Adam was accustomed to go before he sinned," until the cold forced him to accept clothing and a fire.¹⁶

Normally this imprisonment should have meant that the theories of Gottschalk about predestination would soon be forgotten. Hincmar, however, was anxious to change the opinions of Gottschalk. He sent his studied

(Please turn to page seventeen)

¹⁴ This forms part of the interesting matter gathered from certain manuscripts which Dom Morin describes in his articles, "Gottschalk Retrouvé," *Revue Bénédictine*, XLIII, 303-312.

¹⁵ Hincmar, *Epistola ad Egilonem*, edited by Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae*, CXXVI, 70.

¹⁶ Hincmar, *De Una et non Trina Deitate*, edited by Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae*, CXXV, 613.

¹⁷ The most important of the all too few autographs of Gottschalk which we possess. There is no difficulty in "interpreting" his teaching on double predestination as including positive reprobation. On the other hand it is quite possible to consider the work as orthodox and teaching merely negative reprobation. Migne has preserved this work in *Patrologiae Latinae*, CXXI, 349-366.

¹⁰ *Conciliorum Omnium Generalium et Provincialium Collectio Regis*, XXI, 604.

¹¹ These letters have been edited by Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae*, CXII, 1530-1562.

¹² Rabanus Maurus, *Epistola ad Heberardum Comitem*, edited by Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae*, CXII, 1554.

¹³ *Ibidem*, 1554.

Our American Martyrs: A Tercentenary Commemoration

IN June, 1611, a grand adventure was begun. Black-robed Pierre Biard and Ennemond Masse stepped from their little shallop to the strand of Port Royal, New France,—the first Jesuit missionaries to the Northern Indians. For the first few decades their mission gave little promise of its future glorious history. Official disregard, if not outright disapproval, at first; then recurrent attacks, capture and dispersal of the mission personnel by raiding English fleets; the terrific hardships accompanying the conversion-work of wandering, savage tribes pointed to this venture as the "world's most difficult mission." The day to day trials of language, customs and living conditions were even more exacting and discouraging. Despite all these, the Jesuit missions of New France prospered. Blackrobes of the American mission labored among the Indian tribes of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes-Mississippi region: Abenaki, Montagnais, Hurons, Iroquois, Chippewas, Crees, Ottawa, Menomonies, Pottawatomies, Sacs, Foxes, Winnebagoes, Miamis and Illinois. Among these missionaries were Le Jeune, de Nouë, Druillettes, Le Moyne, Rague-neau, Allouez, Marquette and Charlevoix, whose names are commonplace in colonial history.

Three hundred years ago, three decades after the arrival of Fathers Biard and Masse, charred stakes and bloody Iroquois tomahawks bore silent witness to the climax of the Jesuit missionary effort in North America. In the years 1642 to 1649 eight Jesuits, six priests and two donnés, were martyred for the Faith! Fathers Isaac Jogues, John Brébeuf, Anthony Daniel, Gabriel Lalemant, Charles Garnier and Noël Chabanel, and the donnés René Goupil and John La Lande. They are the first canonized Saints of North America. Their title of Jesuit *American Martyrs* is significant and deserved. They are not American martyrs solely because of the providential occurrence of their martyrdom in the forests of colonial Canada and New York. They are truly representative of "the American spirit."

What is the American spirit? Perhaps no one will ever give us a completely satisfactory or exhaustive answer. It is too complex a thing. There are so many different approaches to its analysis. There are so many terms in which it can be expressed. There are so many diverse persons and personalities of which it can be predicated. But we might point out a few of the more or less accepted elements. The American spirit is independent, self-reliant, democratic, courageous, straight-forward, idealistic, adventurous, aggressive, adaptable, tolerant, hospitable,—a subtle distillation of even seemingly contradictory qualities.

How came this American spirit? By what strange alchemy was this congeries of characteristics, not one of which was necessarily indigenous to the New World nor to any of the colonizing powers, "processed" into a vibrant, determining spirit? Frederick Jackson Turner proposed the thesis that the laboratory was the frontier

and the process of character-renovation was the frontier's distinctive mode of life. Professional historians dispute the limit of applicability of Turner's hypothesis. To attribute the formation of the American character solely to frontier influences is generally agreed to be drawing a very long bow. On the other hand, to deny all frontier influence is no more accurate. Somewhere between these two extremes lies the truth. "Amateur" historians and casual readers of American History do not concern themselves with trying to fix with scientific exactitude the nature and extent of frontier influences. They more or less take the notion for granted. Many writers and readers of American historical fiction seem to believe that the frontiersman is *the American*.

We can admit this much: the frontiersman does well exemplify the American spirit in the sweep of American history from earliest colonial times. Perhaps he does it more accurately than any other "figure." Certainly he does it more picturesquely. Independent and self-reliant? There's Boone and Sevier crossing the Alleghannies. Democratic and hospitable? There's La Bonte sharing his campfire and humble meal with anyone who cares to tarry. Idealistic and adventurous? There's Rogers or Clark with visions of empire in the Northwest. Straight-forward yet tolerant? There's "White Eagle" McLaughlin of the Oregon Country. Adaptable, aggressive, courageous? Name every one who ever stepped through the palisades of a frontier post westward or southward or northward into the primeval forest.

The Jesuit missionaries of North America, the Jesuit Martyrs in particular, are exemplars par excellence of these "American" characteristics. Independent and self-reliant? There's Le Moyne, leaving Quebec again, alone, for the Iroquois country. Democratic and hospitable? There's De Crepieul sharing his meagre food and tattered blankets with the Montagnais braves who continually crowd his rude cabin. Idealistic and adventurous? There's Marquette with grand visions of empire for Christ in the valley of the great Mississippi. Straight-forward yet tolerant? There's Druillettes, missionary to the Abenaki, in conference with the Puritans of New England to determine means of common frontier defence against the Iroquois. Adaptable, aggressive, courageous? Name every Blackrobe who served the mission.

But even amongst these Frontiersmen for Christ the Jesuit Martyrs stand out: John Brébeuf, giant of body and soul, dynamic director of the mission outposts, magnificently enduring the horrors of his torture and death; Isaac Jogues, revered as a martyr by pope and royalty even in his own lifetime, returning gladly to the Iroquois mission to face incredible suffering and a cruel death; Noël Chabanel, bound to the hardships he found so repugnant by a special vow of stability, being cut down in the lonesomeness of a Canadian forest by an apostate's hatchet; Anthony Daniel, after a decade of service on the greatest of the Huron missions, riddled by arrows at

the mission chapel door as he seeks to protect his Indians from the fury of the Iroquois; Gabriel Lalemant, seven months at his first mission station, forced to watch the agonized death of Brébeuf before undergoing the same sufferings, pleading for the conversion of his torturers; Charles Garnier, indefatigable in his labors through long years on the mission trails, tomahawked as he struggles, though seriously wounded, to baptize one of his catechumens; René Goupil, surgeon and *donné* teaching the children of his captors the Sign of the Cross, first of the martyrs; John La Lande, youthful trapper, woodsman and *donné*, volunteer for the dangerous Iroquois mission, murdered as he attempts to bury the mutilated body of his companion, Isaac Jogues.

These were heroes, *American* heroes. See Isaac Jogues as he steps into a Huron canoe at Three Rivers to journey westward to his station. From the moment that canoe swings into the river he is on his own. He will have to do his share—at the portages, at the camp. See him in the roughly-made cabin at Ihonitaria, surrounded by stinking, vermin-infested, disease-ridden savages, talking with them, eating of his slender supplies from the same bowl with them, administering the Sacraments to them all day, every day. See him as he kneels at night in his little chapel, eyes afire with visions of a new mission westward to the Sault or southward along the Mohawk. See him at the table of the Dutch in New Amsterdam, calmly discussing religion with men who, were they in Europe, would be his mortal enemies. See him give himself up to the raiding ferocious Iroquois so that he might be at hand to help the captured French and Hurons, knowing that he is choosing the gauntlet, the firebrand, the scalping knife and, at the best, death. Here is truly an American hero.

We know, though, that this is only the least part of the Martyrs' story. A real injustice would be done them if we did not recognize that the dominant characteristics of their lives were a tremendous love of God, a burning zeal and a genuine charity. Their sanctity vitalized and supernaturalized their natural gifts of character. To the Catholic this is an accepted reality. He knows that no event or series of events in history can be reduced by any scientific analysis merely to factors of matter and motion, or even human behavior patterns. There is a Providence. There is an incalculable divine force which influences man's destiny. That force is God's grace. God's grace has given us these *American Saints*.

MARTIN F. HASTING, S. J.

Portugal Treaty

(Continued from page four)

privilege or respectability by the rules of their court and held in so low estimation with them that no proper character would accept it to go abroad."¹⁰ And so, before the views of the United States were fully explained, the Queen appointed a minister resident to the United States.

Unwilling to embarrass a friendly nation Washington decided to send an envoy of the same rank. On consid-

eration of all circumstances, he told the Senate:¹¹ I have determined to accede to the desire of the court of Lisbon, in the article of grade. I am aware that consequences will not end here, and that this is not the only instance in which a like change may be pressed. But should it be necessary to yield elsewhere also, I shall think it a less evil than to disgust a government so friendly and so interesting to us, as that of Portugal. Accordingly, Colonel David Humphries, a personal friend of Washington, who was already in Europe as a special observer for the State Department, was named and confirmed the first resident minister of the United States to the court of Lisbon. He was informed, as was the Senate also, that the change of grade would not "render the mission more expensive."

Our relations with Portugal were not only interesting, as Washington remarked to the Senate, but highly profitable. Although no treaty regulated commerce between the two nations, Portugal, during Washington's administration, was one of the nation's best markets. Late in 1793 Jefferson sent a report to the House of Representatives on the privileges and restrictions on our trade with foreign countries. His statement was restricted "to those countries only, with which we carry on a commerce of some importance." Our chief commercial intercourse was with "Spain, Portugal, France, Great Britain, the United Netherlands, Denmark, and Sweden, and their American possessions." Great Britain, naturally, was the first both in imports and exports. But Portugal was our fifth best foreign market (she purchased annually \$1,283,462 of American goods to Great Britain's \$9,363,416) and ranked fourth in selling to us (we purchased \$595,763 of Portuguese goods to \$15,285,428 of British goods). Portugal was a good market for our grain and bread, salted fish and other salted provisions (today wheat and cod fish are Portugal's most important imports), wood, tar, pitch and turpentine.¹²

Although Humphries has been credited with considerable success both in Lisbon and Madrid, where he was sent in 1795, he was no more successful than Franklin and Jefferson in coaxing a trade agreement from the Lisbon authorities. But he was determined to bring back some monument of his services abroad, and so he returned to his Connecticut home with a flock of one hundred merino sheep (ewes and rams) which did, in fact, promote a new industry in the United States. This was no mean achievement in view of the strict Spanish embargo on the exporting of this breed; to persuade the Spanish authorities to make an exception for him was a minor triumph. Sheep raising became a major enterprise and woolen manufactures a profitable business, thanks to Humphries' initiative and the Napoleonic crisis which checked the flow of manufactured goods to our shores and compelled Spain to lift the embargo on merinos.

William Loughton Smith, a political opponent of Jefferson and therefore an advocate of close relation with England, succeeded Humphries in Lisbon. Smith "worked smoothly with the British diplomats" during his stay (1797-1801) there. Since one could not work smoothly with the British and also work very hard at getting a

¹¹ *Ibid.*, I, 127-128.

¹² Report of the Secretary of State, December 16, 1793, 3d. Cong., 1st. sess., *American State Papers*, I, 300-301.

¹⁰ Message of Washington to the Senate, February 18, 1791, *American State Papers*, I, 127.

commercial agreement which would impair England's economic position in Portugal, Thomas Jefferson assumed the presidential responsibilities with his hopes of an early and beneficial trade treaty with Portugal fast disappearing. Portugal was gravitating closer than ever to her ancient ally under the compulsion of Napoleon's threat to dominate all Europe.¹³

For twenty years the treaty with Portugal was forgotten. With the renewal of the continental struggle between Napoleon and Great Britain in 1803, Jefferson and his successor Madison were plagued with the problems of the rights of neutrals, embargoes, orders in council, impressments, non-importation orders and finally war itself. Isolation from Europe was a beautiful dream. And Portugal almost ceased to exist. The real ruler there from 1809 to 1820 was an English soldier, Marshall Beresford; for when Napoleon persuaded Spain to divide the profits of a portion of England's "continental province," England, in turn, hustled Don John, the regent, off to Brazil and assumed the responsibilities of defending the kingdom against the invaders.¹⁴ Don John took a liking to Brazil, showed an indisputable preference for it to his native land, and so remained there long after the fall of Napoleon. The sole compensation to the United States during these dismal years was the enormous rise in trade, in flour especially, with Spain and Portugal because of the presence of British troops in the Iberian Peninsula.¹⁵

In 1821 Don John returned to Lisbon as king, leaving his son Pedro behind as regent of Brazil, now a kingdom in its own right. King John found a nation seething with revolt and a Cortes, dominated by Liberals, demanding the return of Brazil to a colonial status. James Madison, mindful of Jefferson's high estimate of Portuguese trade, and expecting a restoration of order and some prosperity from John's return, sent General Henry Dearborn to Lisbon in 1822 to conclude a commercial treaty. Dearborn found the nation torn between two political groups, the parliamentarians and the monarchists, led by Don Miguel, the younger son of the King. Though forced to flee from his land again by the monarchists, John was restored with the aid of British arms and retained his throne until his death on March 26, 1826. Despite these unfavorable circumstances, General Dearborn, accustomed to the taste of gunpowder from his experiences in two wars with England, managed to persuade Count de Lapa to accept a commercial treaty based on reciprocity. But the Count failed to persuade the King and the Cortes, and for the fourth time the United States were frustrated from legalizing their commercial relations with Portugal. Lisbon lost what attractions it had for the old general; he was seventy-three, and two years as minister to Portugal were quite sufficient for him. He requested his own recall, and John Quincy Adams agreed to it.

¹³ Stanley T. Williams, "David Humphries," *D. A. B.* IX (1932), 373-375; Anne K. Gregoire, "William Loughton Smith," *D. A. B.* XVII (1935), 365-366.

¹⁴ A sympathetic study of Portugal during these years will be found in George Edmunson, "Brazil and Portugal," *Cambridge Modern History* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1934), X, 310-340.

¹⁵ W. F. Galpin, "American Grain Trade to the Spanish Peninsula, 1810-1814," *American Historical Review*, XXVIII (October, 1922), 24-44.

Civil strife soon followed the death of the king. With the aid of 5,000 "British bayonets" a Charter was imposed on Portugal in 1826, and only after taking an oath to support the Charter was Don Miguel allowed to enter the kingdom as a regent. Miguel was a confirmed monarchist, but he was popular; in the summer of 1828 he managed to have the crown offered to him by the Cortes, and he was proclaimed King. Both in Lisbon and throughout the land the proclamation was received with enthusiasm. He was the "idol of the populace" despite his lack of respect for the liberties granted by the Charter. But Sir Anthony Lamb, the English ambassador, immediately suspended relations with the Court, and his action was followed by most of the diplomats resident in Lisbon. The United States, however, were not to be governed by the behavior of European nations. Once she was satisfied that Miguel was the de facto sovereign, she received his diplomatic representative, and our chargé d'affaires, in Lisbon, Thomas L. L. Brent, was ordered to resume his official position. Out of gratitude for this recognition Miguel might, if granted sufficient time, have signed a favorable trade treaty with the United States. He did sign a claims convention. But civil war soon returned to harassed Portugal; Miguel was ousted with the aid of foreign forces, and Maria, daughter of Pedro, was substituted. Again, diplomatic relations were suspended, and Brent was recalled.¹⁶

But the suspension was brief this time. In December, 1834, Andrew Jackson received the appointed representative of Queen Maria, and in return he named Edward Kavanagh, the only prominent Catholic layman of New England in public life at the time, as our chargé d'affaires in Lisbon. Washington's desire to have at that post a diplomat of the lowest rank had now been realized. The long-sought commercial treaty, too, had been forgotten; for Kavanagh's early instructions made no mention of it, and he was told to concentrate on the collection of long standing claims. But it was Kavanagh, to the surprise of many in Lisbon and Washington, who had the honor of concluding the first treaty with Portugal.

The half-century of talks, delays, suspensions, renewal of talks, apparent success and unexpected obstacles did not make his task any easier, even though, once again, the authorities in Lisbon took the initiative of broaching the subject. Only a man of remarkable patience and ability could have seen the negotiations through with success. He was aided, it is true, by the desire and determination of a group anxious to break the ancient economic ties with England, but our previous representatives too had been so helped. Portugal was not master of her own affairs, and the political unrest made long conferences and frequent exchanges of views, necessary preliminaries to a treaty, practically impossible.

Cabinets came and disappeared before Kavanagh could properly introduce himself and become acquainted with

¹⁶ A concise and fairly accurate summary of diplomatic relations between Portugal and the United States during the years 1783-1840 will be found in Hunter Miller (ed.), *Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1931 —), IV, 323. Miller's notes are taken from a memorandum prepared by an official attached to the Portuguese foreign office and appended by Edward Kavanagh, chargé d'affaires in Lisbon from 1835-1841, to one of his despatches to the State Department.

the head of the foreign office. Before fourteen months of his residence in Lisbon had elapsed he had made the acquaintance of four different ministers of Foreign Affairs. During the remaining months he worked with six more ministers, two of whom had held the position before. Eight different ministers, ten changes in less than six years; he met the hierarchy of the nobility and a few from the commons: a duke, a marquis, a count, two viscounts, a baron and two untitled gentlemen. Besides ministerial changes and shiftings within the cabinet, he witnessed one important revolution, two unsuccessful counter-revolutions, a blockade, many intrigues, much rioting, and more than once "disorders, assassinations and robberies . . . throughout the kingdom."¹⁷ Amidst all these disturbances, the negotiations proceeded at a snail's pace. But Kavanagh admitted that Portugal had a right to proceed with caution; for in 1840 the treaty was far more important to her than to the United States since it was her hope "to found her future commercial intercourse with all, upon the principles of perfect independence and real reciprocity."¹⁸ Not only was she breaking away from the past under great difficulties, but the treaty with the United States, now under consideration, would be the model of her relations with all other nations.

At last the treaty was signed,—a treaty which was made "En Nome da Santissima e Indivisel Trindade." A hundred years ago Christian nations did not hesitate to recognize the Most Blessed Trinity in their treaties.

In content the treaty was similar to the many other commercial agreements made with European countries; in time and in energy expended to conclude, it was *sui generis*. Its singularity reminds one of pertinent facts about foreign relations. Foreign relations are not solely under the direct control of the nations immediately concerned; they are not, frequently, what the two interested parties want. Portugal and the United States wanted a commercial agreement in 1783; they waited until 1841. Our relations with Portugal were dictated more by forces and factors in Europe than by the foreign offices in Lisbon and Washington. And if on many occasions the United States prospered by the troubles of Europe, so, too, the United States were at the mercy of those troubles on other occasions. The history of the first treaty with Portugal is a minor but exceptionally clear instance of this. Foreign relations and policies are not simple, routine realities of a nation's reasoned aspirations and demands. They are frequently complicated compromises. It is true of small and weak nations, as we have discovered. It is true of world powers, too.

¹⁷ Edward Kavanagh's mission to Portugal and his negotiation of the first treaty with the United States are studied in William L. Lucey, *Edward Kavanagh Catholic Statesman Diplomat from Maine 1796-1844* (Francetown, N. H.: Marshall Jones Company, 1946), pp. 122-159.

¹⁸ Despatch No. 112, August 31, 1840, National Archives, 13 Portugal.

EDITOR'S NOTE: The *Bulletin* had hoped to be able to offer a review of *Edward Kavanagh* in this issue. Unfortunately due to unsettled labor conditions, this biography has been delayed in making its appearance. However, we hope that the next issue of the *Bulletin* will carry a review of this work.

St. Augustine

(Continued from page six)

the text of the Rule of Saint Augustine as we have it today; Fr. Mandonnet calls this the *Commentary*. Saint Augustine, as Fr. Mandonnet points out, wrote the *Disciplina Monasterii*, a rule adequate for the direction of a community of men, while still a layman at Tagaste. Thus its preceptive force would be nil, the authority of the father or superior flowing solely from his subjects. This would be the same today if, for example, some well known convert gathered about himself a group of other Catholic laymen, wrote a set of rules or by-laws for them, as they co-habited the same apartment. Consequently, the very wording of the *Disciplina* lacks preceptive force: "Let them honor their father . . . etc."

With the transfer of the monastery to Hippo, however, Augustine enjoyed the authority of a priest, and he shows this in writing the addition or commentary attached to his original Rule. Thus, in the commentary he refers to himself as a priest and he commands: "obey your superior as a father." Or, as Fr. Huempfer, O.S.A., points out, Augustine wrote the *Disciplina Monasterii* in 388 for the monastery founded in his own family estate in Tagaste where he was *pater* of his *societas*. Augustine then composed the commentary on his original Rule, after he was ordained, for the monastery erected in the garden near the episcopal palace—here he appears as the head of the *societas*, above the *praepositus*, with the added dignity of *presbyter*.¹⁵ And Fr. Denis Kavanagh, O.S.A., commenting on the passage "*factus ergo presbyter monasterium infra ecclesiam mox instituit*" in St. Possidius' *Vita Sancti Augustini*, writes that the phrase "*infra ecclesiam*" does not mean, as some commentators interpret it "within the church building" or "within the precincts of the church," but rather "within the church, i.e. under ecclesiastical authority."¹⁶

That the Rule of Saint Augustine as we have it today was merely a commentary on some other form of legislation or regulation is evident. It would be very difficult to regulate a community of men on our present day Rule alone—Saint Augustine must have surely had his original Rule in mind when he wrote his commentary. In our present day Rule there are allusions made as to what ought to be done in the community without mentioning anything determinate. For example, we read in Chapter III: "Give yourselves to prayer at the hours and times *appointed* . . . if anyone has the time and wishes to pray outside the hours *appointed* . . . chant only what is prescribed"; yet nowhere in the present day Rule will there be found any references to these things *appointed* and prescribed. But we can find these times *appointed* and things *prescribed* in the *Disciplina Monasterii* which liturgists claim to be the oldest *Ordo officii* known in the Church.¹⁷

Dom de Bruyne once attempted to show that the *Disciplina* was the work of Saint Benedict, the first

¹⁵ Arbesmann-Huempfer, *op. cit.*, p. lxxviii.

¹⁶ Denis J. Kavanagh, O.S.A., "The First Augustinian Monastery ('infra ecclesiam')," *Tagastan*, III, 1, pp. 3-12.

¹⁷ Dom Lambot, O.S.B., "Un ordo officii du Ve siecle," *Revue benédicte*, XLVV (1930), 80.

rule he gave his monks at Subiaco (500-505), but the well known Benedictine scholar Dom Morin closed the road to this theory, declaring in his conclusion that "it will be necessary to be resigned to the loss of the first pretended Rule of Saint Benedict."¹⁸ This was in 1931. Dom Morin likewise placed the composition of the *Disciplina Monasterii* somewhere in the first half of the 5th century.

With regard to the wording of the *Disciplina*, Fr. Mandonnet cautions that it must be remembered that Augustine wrote it while still a layman but recently converted. It may be objected that Augustine didn't write the *Disciplina* for his monks, as it reads in places "let them . . ." This was the wording where Augustine regulates manual labor, for the author himself was busily engaged in writing books at this time. Thus we see that the oldest extant manuscript containing the complete Rule of Saint Augustine includes the original Rule and the Commentary Saint Augustine added to it after he was ordained a priest. What we know as the Rule of Saint Augustine today is not the same as that which Augustine's first followers knew. What happened to the original *Disciplina Monasterii*?

V. The beheading of the Rule of Saint Augustine.

The second half of the 11th century was a period of reformation in the Church, and with regard to the reformation of the clergy, one of its fruits was the organization of the canonical life. It was only natural that the 11th century, looking back into the history of the Church should single out the first organizer of religious life in the West, Saint Augustine, as a model to be followed. In the 12th century, so well organized was the reform of the clergy, that the Rule of Saint Augustine extended to the whole canonical set-up, and the two expressions, "Regular Canonical Order" and "Augustinian Order" were synonymous.

The text of the Rule of Saint Augustine in use among the Order of Premontr  at the time of its organization around 1120, was the entire Rule of Saint Augustine. The Premonstratensian liturgical texts preserved this form of the Rule for us until the 17th century. In fact, the Premonstratensians never abrogated or changed this entire Rule, according to the Abbot of Pont-a-Mousson (1614).¹⁹ Practically speaking, however, the *Disciplina Monasterii* has been a dead letter with these Canons since the middle of the 12th century.

Briefly, the separation of the two parts of the Rule took place in this wise. The brothers of the community of Canons Regular at Springirsbach in the diocese of Trier, who had been following the complete Rule of Saint Augustine from the year 1107, found that the *Disciplina*, with its regulations for Office, fasting and manual labor were not suitable. The canons, therefore, decided to refer the matter to Pope Gelesius II (1118-19), and, as Fr. Mandonnet points out, in 1118 that Pontiff had not the least doubt that the *Disciplina Monasterii* was a part of the Rule of Saint Augustine. It seems as though the Augustinian Canons of Springirsbach had some cause for readjustment—the *ordo* in the *Disciplina* for reciting the Divine Office was antiquated, and one meal a day

after None was too impractical for religious living in northern Europe in the 12th century; and finally, the regulation for manual labor was more suitable to primitive Augustinian monasteries where there were many laymen living together than it was to a community of clerical canons. The Holy Father in a letter dated at Rome, August 11, 1118, responded to the difficulties of the canons:²⁰

To the Reverend Superior and his brothers of the Church of Springirsbach, health and apostolic benediction. Our attention has been called to the problem raised among you concerning the Rule of Saint Augustine: to-wit: "certain prescriptions are included therein for the Office, manual labor and fasting which cannot be observed in our provinces." Suitable moderation ought to be the guide in such matters. With the grace of God, whatever pertains to advancement in virtuous living ought to be observed. On the other hand, *what the same Doctor has written on the Office* cannot be followed, because it does not now accord with the usage of Rome and other Churches. The Rule of Saint Benedict likewise contains certain prescriptions on observance of this kind, but the practice in the monasteries is quite different; nevertheless, the profession of the monks is not on that account invalidated. Therefore we command that the Office be celebrated among you according to the custom of the Catholic Church. Indeed, manual labor and fasting should be undertaken with consideration for the climate of the country and the ability of the persons, but in that regard, the customs among the regular brethren should be followed . . .

So, by order of the Pope, the three chief prescriptions of the *Disciplina Monasterii* were deleted, thus making it a dead letter; for the incidental prescriptions contained in it were treated in the Commentary. Here we see the elimination of that part which gave the complete Rule its constitutional character—that part which made it a Rule. Of the original work of the Patriarch of Hippo, there remained only the spiritual and moral commentary, known today as the Rule of Saint Augustine. The shortened Rule gradually became the norm for all canons, and the *Disciplina Monasterii* passed into oblivion, and its directive prescriptions were thenceforward supplanted by Constitutions, as was the case with the Dominicans and the Augustinian Hermits in the following century.

VI. Letter 211 to the Nuns

The opinion which prevailed amongst scholars that Saint Augustine wrote a letter to nuns giving them some general precepts, and that from this was formed the "Regula ad servos Dei" for men, seems today to have been successfully denied. Fr. Nicholas Merlin, O.S.A., is inclined to think that Saint Augustine never wrote a Rule for women, and he bases his conclusions on the following points:

1. The manuscripts for the Rule for women go back no farther than the 13th century—while the complete text of the Rule for men goes back almost to the time of Saint Augustine.
2. The manuscripts containing the letter to the nuns with the Rule subjoined are much less correct and faithful to the authentic text than the Rule for men.
3. A great many of the manuscripts containing the Rule for women depend in an evident manner on the manuscripts of the Rule for men.²¹

Fr. Merlin also notes some of the conclusions of Dom Lambot, who, writing in the *Revue b n dictine* in October, 1929, showed how Saint Caesarius of Arles, in composing his *Regula ad Virgines* for the monastery of St. John of Arles in 524, uses nearly half of the Augustinian Rule for men. Thus Saint Caesarius must have known of the Rule of Saint Augustine for men, and not that for women, else he would have used the latter; for he was

¹⁸ Dom G. Morin, *op. cit.*

¹⁹ Cf. Mandonnet, *op. cit.*, 244.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 246-47. Latin text, P.L. CLXIII, 496.

²¹ N. Merlin, *op. cit.*, 22.

writing for women. Moreover, the unknown author of *Regula Taratensis* in the 6th century borrowed heavily from Saint Augustine's Rule for men. We find no leaders of the religious life in the early Middle Ages using the Rule of Saint Augustine for women appended to the Saint's letter 211.

Finally, Fr. Merlin argues against the probable Augustinian authorship of the Rule for women from the clumsy way in which it is inserted into Letter 211. We read in the letter how Saint Augustine admonishes the nuns to repent of their disturbances and recognize their superior; then without any rhyme or reason we see inserted a Rule. The discontinuity in letter 211 is easily recognizable. Moreover, are we to presume that Augustine would write a Rule for nuns in 423, yet forget about any legislation for his own communities begun 30 years previously?²²

Fr. Mandonnet thinks that Saint Augustine was the composer of three texts: the *Disciplina Monasterii*, the Commentary, and that in letter 211 to the nuns. He then shows how the prejudice—that Saint Augustine wrote a Rule for nuns and from this was copied the Rule for men—is an ancient mis-statement. It came into being about fifty years after the disappearance of the *Disciplina Monasterii* in the 12th century. In the 16th century, Erasmus—who was once an Augustinian Canon—again brought forth the opinion that the Rule for Sisters was Augustine's and that the Rule for men was drawn from it. Since the 16th century, the opinion of Erasmus has been held widely, so that in modern times, without much investigation, the dependence of the Rule for men on the Rule for women has been taken as an established fact. Fr. Mandonnet is resolute in saying that there is absolutely nothing to show that the text for the Rule for women was the basis of the Rule for men. If the Rule of Saint Augustine is made to consist merely in the Commentary without any regard for the *Disciplina*, there would be difficulty in deciding on the primacy of the texts; but when the ancient Rule of Saint Augustine is reconstituted into its two parts, the female form of the Commentary loses all right to be considered the primitive text. And this is just what has been proven in the manuscript tradition. Fr. Mandonnet then concludes that St. Augustine actually did write the text appended to letter 211, and he states that as far as he knows it was practiced by no other community save that at Hippo for which it was written.²³

VII. Conclusions

We may sum up our conclusions on this discussion of the Rule of Saint Augustine as follows: (1) The complete Rule of Saint Augustine as we read it in the most ancient manuscripts is made up of two parts: (a) the original Rule, the *Disciplina Monasterii*; and (b) the Commentary. (2) That which we call the Rule of Saint Augustine today is nothing other than the commentary Saint Augustine wrote on his original Rule. (3) Saint Augustine's first monastic legislation was for his own community of men, and the Rule for nuns appended to letter 211, whether written by our Saint or not, is dependent on the original Rule for men.

²² *Ibid.*, ch. IV, *passim*.

²³ Mandonnet, *op. cit.*, 232-240, *passim*.

Motley's Prussianism

(Continued from page eight)

despotism by which he had so often characterized Prussia had apparently been metamorphosed into a democracy by his daring and adroit Prussian friend.

The strongest and most progressive force now in operation in the world is the democratic principle and it is of this principle that the union of Germany, now an almost accomplished fact, is the legitimate growth. Democracy highly educated, led and disciplined by the military science and resolution of Prussia and directed by the most daring and adroit statesman in Europe, has achieved results which have astounded the imagination of mankind and are often absurdly ascribed to a successful series of plots by German sovereigns against her weaker neighbors. . . . Germany is soluble in Prussia and united Germany whether at first and nominally entitled Empire or Republic is sure to be a free progressive and enlightened commonwealth whose existence is favorable to civilization and to the peace of the world.¹⁸

When the peace negotiations were in progress, Motley feared that his Prussian hero might err on the side of severity, so he attempted to counsel him, telling Bismarck that he had few warmer or more attached personal friends than himself.

I yield to no one in admiration of your splendid career, and in my conviction that true patriotism, faith in the high destiny of united Germany and loyalty to your Sovereign have been the guides which have steadily led you to those great achievements which History will always delight to dwell upon.

Nor can any man, not born a German, have longed more earnestly to see the unity established of the great Mother country of us all than I have done for years long. . . . It is a theme to inspire the dullest man with eloquence when he sees an intimate friend of his youth, and manhood become, as you have been a central figure of interest and importance for the whole civilized world.¹⁹

After this declaration of true friendship, Motley ventures modestly to suggest

that the more moderate the terms on the part of the Conqueror at this supreme moment, the greater would be the confidence inspired for the future, and the more secure the foundations of a durable peace, and the more proud and fortunate the position and character of United Germany. . . . I cannot bear the thought that the lustre of what is now the pure and brilliant though bloody triumph of Germany should be tarnished by even a breath.²⁰

To the degree in which he eulogized Bismarck he condemned Napoleon III. He denounced those Englishmen who favored France in the struggle and declared that they were animated by an instinctive dislike for democracy, whereas he thought that all believers in progress and growth of republican principles hoped for the triumph of German unity. "This war," he said, "was between the type of military personnel and aggressive monarchy on the one side and a national democracy on the other side seeking to consolidate itself into one vast Teutonic commonwealth disciplined by Prussian military science and pervaded by universal education."²¹

In most of his derogatory statements about Napoleon III Motley distinguished between the "Reckless adventurer" and the French people. However, after his last visit to Bismarck in 1872, in a eulogy of his Prussian friend and the German people, one finds a paragraph

¹⁸ Motley to Seward, No. 404. July 28, 1870. N.A. (Despatches, Great Britain).

¹⁹ Motley to Bismarck, September 9, 1870, Mildmay, pp. 288-293.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 291. Cf. Count Otto zu Stolberg-Weringerode, *Germany and United States during the Era of Bismarck* (Reading, Pa., 1937), p. 130, says that Motley was here reflecting the views of the British rather than those of the American people.

²¹ Motley to Seward, No. 415. August 6, 1870. N.A. (Despatches, Great Britain).

that might well have been cited from *Mein Kampf*. Apparently there is no question in Motley's mind at this time that France had been the aggressor in Central Europe and that not only Germany but Europe and the world in general benefited by the defeat of France in 1870.

A great powerful, united Germany has been the dream of every enthusiastic youth in the fatherland for generation after generation. The substitution of the solid, healthy Teutonic influence for the Latinized Celtic, the control of Central Europe by a united nation of deep thinkers and straight-forward, honest strikers for liberty and Fatherland, instead of a race who have overrun all neighboring countries century after century for the sake of 'la gloire' and who avow that their grandeur is necessarily founded on the weakness, distraction and disintegration of other nations, that united Italy and United Germany are insults and injuries to France, only to be wiped out by war,—this has been the national aspiration ever since the Peace of Westphalia, when Germany was cut up into three hundred and seven pieces.²²

His praise for things "Prussian" reached great heights in an address before the New York Historical Society in 1869 when he proclaimed that, "Ever since the great rising for freedom against the Roman empire, down to this hour, Germany has been the main source of European and American culture. The common mother of nations and empires—*alma mater felix prole*—she still rules the thought of her vast brood of children: Franks, Goths, Saxons, Lombards, Normans, Netherlands, Americas, Germans all."²³

In his blind admiration of Prussian culture during his later years Motley had many companions on both sides of the Atlantic.²⁴ But one wonders why this American historian had lost sight of the intrinsic evils in the aggressive militarism of Prussia. There was a time when he saw the tyranny of the system; for in 1841 he had described it as such, "... Prussia is a camp, and its whole population drilled to the bayonet. It is the fashion to praise its good administration. Prussia is a mild despotism to be sure. 'Tis the homeopathic tyranny—small doses, constantly administered, and strict diet and regimen. . . . Everything, in fact, is regulated by the Government; the royal colors are black and white, and Government is written in black and white all over the kingdom."²⁵

Might one conjecture that the "success theory" of German historians caused a reversal of his political views some twenty years later when he longed for a "strong man" to bring this Prussian state to a position where she might control not only Germany but likewise bring peace to Europe?

Yet if there were a young vigorous, intellectual sovereign in Prussia at this moment, a man like Frederick the Great, or Peter the Great, he would see that the time has arrived for Prussia to secure at last the object of its ambition, the imperial crown of Germany. If the house of Brandenburg, which governs the powerful, wholly German and prosperous Prussia could become emperors of Germany . . . then there might be a real Germany, and a handsome solution to the present European question.²⁶

The philosophy of the Prussian historical school was compatible with the "manifest idea" pervading much of American thought in the late nineteenth century. It was the period of the rapid growth of the West as well as of the amazing advance of science, and more than one American was convinced that Germany was but following the path set by the United States. These people felt that the rapid unification of Germany was founded on democracy, the same inevitable principle that had led to such a glorious American Republic. In 1864 Motley

had said, "I firmly believe that the democratic principle is as inviolable and absolute a fact upon our soul . . . as any of its marked geological and geographical features, and that it is as much a necessary historical and philosophical result as they are."²⁷

Even though he felt that the rise of Prussia to the position of a great European power was likewise the result of her obedience to a similar law of her existence, that of an aggressive military monarchy, it was probably Motley's blind admiration for the "power politics" of Bismarck that caused him to read into the history of Prussia what he wanted to find there.

Democracy highly educated, led and disciplined by the military science of Prussia. . . . Germany is soluble in Prussia and united Germany whether at first and nominally entitled Empire or Republic is sure to be a free progressive and enlightened commonwealth whose existence is favorable to civilization and to the peace of the world.²⁸

²² Motley to Holmes, August 17, 1872. *Correspondence*, II, 351.

²³ *Historic Progress*, pp. 39-40.

²⁴ Cf. Russell B. Nye, *George Bancroft Brahmin Rebel* (New York, 1944), pp. 241-280, for very similar views of one of Motley's contemporaries, also the analysis of Gazley, *op. cit.* The latter shows that although American sympathies fluctuated in the period of the Austrian-Prussian struggle, there was a minority group among the democrats who saw that German unity was but a cloak to hide Hohenzollern aggression, but the majority of Americans were ardent supporters of Prussia.

²⁵ Motley to his wife, November 18, 1941. *Correspondence*, I, 70.

²⁶ Motley to his mother, June 5, 1859. *Correspondence*, I, 324.

²⁷ Motley to Lily, November 23, 1864. *Correspondence*, II, 192-193.

²⁸ Motley to Seward, No. 404. July 28, 1870. N.A. (Despatches, Great Britain.)

Gottschalk

(Continued from page ten)

opinions to Gottschalk and allowed Gottschalk to issue a defense (his *Prolixior Confessio*¹⁷) and to write to Amolo, archbishop of Lyons and to Gislemarus, a monk of Corbie. The teachings of Gottschalk became so widespread in the archdiocese of Reims that Hincmar found it necessary to defend himself in his *Ad Simplices et Reclusos*,¹⁸ only to find Ratramnus of Corbie enter the fray as his opponent. Still Hincmar did not prevent Gottschalk from writing about predestination as we learn from Gottschalk's poetic letter to Ratramnus.¹⁹

Between the years 850 and 860 we learn little about Gottschalk in connection with the predestination controversy. However, it was precisely during this period that the controversy took on major proportions, involving the greatest theologians of the Carolingian empire. The enormous amount of writing occasioned by this controversy furnish us with most of the source material for the life of Gottschalk. Perhaps, then, it will not be amiss to include a short summary of the events of the controversy, so that we can appreciate the circumstances which occasioned this important source matter.

The controversy centered around the four points treated by Hincmar in the second council of Kiersy,²⁰

¹⁸ This work was discovered in manuscript form in the University of Leyden and published by Wm. Von Gundlach in the year 1889. The text is found in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, X, 258-309.

¹⁹ This poem is preserved by Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae*, CXXI, 367-372.

²⁰ These canons, of course, came after the controversy had reached its apex but are a good summary of the questions involved. For the full text of these canons, cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.*, IV, 198.

held in the year 853: (1) The nature of predestination; (2) The nature of man's will for good, after the will has been restored by grace; (3) Whether or not God wills the salvation of all men; (4) Whether Christ shed his blood for all.

Actually there does not seem to have been any real basic difference of opinion regarding these four points. All of the major contestants (with the exception of John Scotus and, perhaps, Ebbo of Grenoble) seem to have known what the Catholic teaching was on these points and accepted them. Each, however, misunderstanding the terminology used by his opponents, accused the others of heresy.

The whole dispute started when Hincmar, and his suffragan, Prudence, bishop of Laon, sought opinions concerning the writings of Gottschalk and Ratramnus. They received very short and unsatisfactory replies from Lupus of Ferrières and from Prudence, bishop of Troyes. In the meanwhile, Hincmar and Pardulus made the unfortunate mistake of asking Amalarius and John Scotus, men of ill-repute, to give their opinions.

Amalarius governed the see of Lyons after Agobard had been deposed because of his political opposition to Louis the Pious in 833. In this capacity he succeeded in winning the hatred both of Agobard and of the famous master of the Cathedral School of Lyons, the deacon Florus. When Agobard was restored to his see, both he and Florus attacked the writings of Amalarius and succeeded in having him censured at a synod held at Kiersy in 838 for his opinions concerning the meaning of the parts of the divided host at Mass.

John Scotus did even more harm. Florus says²¹ of his work entitled *De Praedestinatione*, that it was obvious that John Scotus was not so much interested in establishing catholic doctrine as he was in presenting his own philosophical opinions. The work was generally naturalistic and pantheistic, and contained here and there bits of the heresies of Pelagius and Origen.

Some time early in 850 the controversy was brought to the notice of Charles the Bald. Charles, who enjoyed theological controversies, asked Lupus and Ratramnus (considered the foremost theologians of his kingdom) for their studied opinions. The extensive treatises which they wrote on the subject were sent by Charles to Hincmar. Hincmar then tried unsuccessfully to have the aged Rabanus Maurus write a major refutation. He also wrote to the church of Lyons for support.

Amolo, the archbishop of Lyons, and Florus had been rather favorable to Hincmar at first. However, after Scotus had written in 850, Florus turned against Hincmar. Another anonymous writer of Lyons, perhaps Ebbo, the future bishop of Grenoble, added his writings to the mounting opposition to Hincmar.²²

In 853 the conflict took a new turn. Hincmar, with the approval of Charles the Bald, had the teaching of double predestination condemned in a synodal council

held at Kiersy. The council of Valence in 854 countered with a condemnation of the canons of Kiersy. The council of Savonieres, which was called in 859 for the purpose of bringing about a compromise, failed in its purpose. This compromise was not obtained until the council of Tuzey which was held in 860.²³

Even after 860 Gottschalk tried to have his teachings accepted. A fellow-monk, Guntbert, tried to carry his writings to Pope Nicholas I in 865 or 866. We do not know whether he succeeded or not, but we do know that the pope had learned of the controversy from other sources. Wisely, however, he remained silent. The controversy had really ended with the council of Tuzey.

Gottschalk was not content to be engaged in one controversy. He seems to have filled his leisure time during his years at Hautvillers by engaging in still other theological discussions. There was a friendly discussion about the Beatific Vision of God.²⁴ When Hincmar forbade the singing of the stanza which contained the words "Te Trina Deitas," he wrote against this, insisting that Hincmar was in heresy.²⁵ Hincmar, was, in the strict sense, more correct, although this particular verse is accepted today because it has been explained properly and because of its long traditional use.

Gottschalk seems to have deteriorated mentally during his last days. Hincmar has preserved some prophecies of Gottschalk which are definite signs of hallucination and insanity.²⁶ He says, for example, that Gottschalk wrote to certain close friends of his telling them that it was revealed to him that within three and a half years after the revelation, Hincmar would die, and that he, Gottschalk, would become the new archbishop; that after seven years in that office, he would be poisoned, thus to be like to the glory of the martyrs. When these prophecies were not fulfilled, Hincmar says Gottschalk wrote to a certain young man, saying that prayers must be offered continually that God would fulfill those things which were revealed regarding Hincmar.

Even to the last Gottschalk refused to deny double predestination. Hincmar tried his best to have him change, but, when he refused at his death-bed, Hincmar forbade the monks of Hautvillers to give him the last sacraments. "Thus," says Hincmar, "he ended an unworthy life by a fitting death and went into his place."²⁷ This was about the year 868 or 869.

In spite of the fact that Gottschalk's life is strange and tragic and, in many respects, difficult to understand, it will always remain a very interesting study for the historian. We can hope that, just as recent years have turned up further evidence about his life, so still other documents will be found which shall help us to understand his life and especially his teachings. Certainly we can hope that they will give us a more favorable picture of the unhappy monk.

²³ The documents referring to these councils have been preserved in *Conciliorum Omnium Generalium et Provincialium Collectio Regis*, XXI and XXII.

²⁴ Traube gives us the details of this discussion, *loc. cit.*, 715.

²⁵ This discussion gave us the lengthy work of Hincmar entitled *De Una et non Trina Deitate*, edited by Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae*, CXXV, 473-618.

²⁶ *De Una et non Trina Deitate*, *loc. cit.*, 613.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 618.

²¹ Florus, *Ecclesiae Lugdunensis Adversus J. Scotus Erroneas Definitiones*, edited by Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae*, CXIX, 101-103.

²² The enormous amount of writing called forth by this controversy can be found scattered throughout six volumes of Migne's *Patrologiae Latinae*: CXV, CXVI, CXIX, CXXI, CXXII and CXXV.

Recent Books in Review

European History

Central-Eastern Europe, Crucible of World Wars, by Joseph S. Roucek and Associates. New York. Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1946. pp. ix + 667. \$5.00

In a very ambitious project Joseph S. Roucek and ten associates have attempted to present a political, economic, social and cultural history of all the countries of Central-Eastern Europe from their origins to the present time. Within the space of 667 pages are compressed the histories of Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Russia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Romania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Albania, Greece, and Turkey. Moreover, interspersed among the histories of the individual countries are chapters on Central-Eastern Europe's place in world affairs, on international relations between two wars, and on German and Russian occupation. The book concludes with a consideration of the Russian sphere of influence in that section of Europe at present.

The authors have been overly ambitious and have attempted to cover too much. Primarily, the project suffers from being a compilation; for the tone of the book is uneven. Although it is an excellent idea to have authorities on the histories of individual countries contribute chapters dealing with their respective fields, the end result too often resembles a Chamber of Commerce brochure, extolling the virtues of a country and minimizing, if not omitting entirely, the less favorable aspects of national life. The unhappy consequence is that one author treats very sympathetically the country of his origin or of his special interest, whereas another author considers that same country as reactionary, fascist, dictatorial, etc., in its connection with the state whose history he is tracing.

Furthermore, in the attempt to compress so much data between the covers of a single volume, accuracy is at times sacrificed for the sake of brevity. Similarly, better editing and proof-reading would have corrected definite inaccuracies and typographical errors. Several examples can be cited. In Roucek's chapter on the early history of Czechoslovakia, he writes concerning John Hus: "Hus castigated Church abuses in a general way at first, but was considered a heretic when he attacked the immoral life of the priests. Following his lengthy theological doubts and disputes, he sought information from the English heretic Wycliffe." (p. 66). Hus was not branded as a heretic because of his demands for clerical reform. Rather, he continued in his attacks on the abuses current in the Church at the time until he was led to deny the authority of the Church. He passed from reform to heresy and hence came under the doctrinal judgment of the Church. As to the quest of information from Wycliffe, the Englishman had died in 1384. Hus did not become a priest until 1400, nor rector of Prague University until 1402. The theological disputes followed after that date. There is no evidence that Hus and Wycliffe were ever in direct contact. On two separate

occasions (pp. 89, 135) the Battle of Tannenberg is dated 1415, whereas it occurred in 1410. Warsaw is stated to have been under Prussian rule after the Partitions of Poland (pp. 121, 371) when, in fact, it was the capital of the Congress Kingdom of Poland under Russian control and continued to be the center of Russian power in Poland until 1914. On p. 206 it is noted that in the schism between the churches of the East and West, Boris (of Bulgaria) chose the Eastern Church in 1870. Undoubtedly, the author means 870. In a footnote to p. 317 the title of G. E. R. Gedye's book is listed as *Betrayal in the Balkans*, whereas the correct title is *Betrayal in Central Europe*.

Despite the criticisms noted, the book has much to recommend it. There is an excellent critical bibliography on each of the countries treated, and the book is well annotated. Considering the scope and the complexity of the subjects treated, the style is clear and the entire book very readable. Moreover, it enables the reader to obtain an over-all picture of the struggle for existence by the small states and their brief period of independence between the two World Wars. With the exception of Russia the countries of Central-Eastern Europe have never been and are not today the masters of their destiny. Through the centuries those regions have been the arena in which Austria-Hungary, the Ottoman Empire, Russia, England, France and Italy have vied for power and influence. Today the number of interested Big Powers has been reduced to two, Soviet Russia and Great Britain, with the latter's influence limited to Greece, and with Russia dominating all the rest.

In view of contemporary events, this book serves as a good reference study for conditions in countries neighboring Soviet Russia. It is especially timely at the present when the question, whether Central-Eastern Europe shall become the crucible of a third World War, is uppermost in the deliberations of the foreign offices and in the thoughts of all men.

St. Louis University

ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI.

Prussian Military Reforms, 1786-1813, by William O. Shanahan. New York. Columbia University Press. 1945. pp. 270. \$3.25

Under Frederick the Great Prussia had risen to the position of a great European power, mainly through her military prowess and leadership. However, after the death of Frederick II (1786) the fortunes of Prussia declined steadily until the once proud Prussian Army was humbled by the brilliant strategy and tactics of Napoleon at Jena and Auerstadt (1806). As a result Prussia lost approximately half of her territories in the east and the west, and her army was limited to 40,000 men by the Treaty of Paris (1808). Yet, five years later a large Prussian army of approximately 160,000 men was able to take the field against Napoleon in the War of Liberation and to contribute greatly to his defeat at Leipzig.

The standard explanation of the amazing and rapid

resurgence of the Prussian army after the defeat at Jena has been the use of the *Krumper* system. Recruits were taken into the army for a few months, given a concentrated training and then demobilized into the reserve. In this way, according to the proponents of this theory, the number prescribed by Napoleon was never exceeded, but a well-trained reserve army was established.

The author of this monograph believes that this theory is an historical legend. After tracing in great detail the early efforts of military reformers to revive and reconstitute the former glory of the Prussian army, the author concludes that up to 1813 the *Krumper* system was ineffective. It was merely the traditional Prussian method of conscripting troops via the canton system whereby a regiment was assigned to a certain district (called canton) to draw recruits from that district. *Krumper* was the military slang term for a cantonist who had received a few months training in the army and had been released to his civil occupation, a practice in effect long before 1806.

The true explanation, according to the author, was the proclamation of universal military service for all Prussian subjects. The canton system had applied mainly to peasants; for exemptions had been granted to most of the other classes. In February, 1813, however, after Napoleon's debacle in Russia, universal service was adopted with all former exemptions repealed. Brief training was given to the new recruits, and they were added to the cadres of the trained troops of the regular army. The army was thus quickly expanded and was able to contribute to the defeat of Napoleon.

The author succeeds better in breaking down the traditional view concerning the character and the importance of the *Krumper* system than in proving that Prussian revival was due to the proclamation of universal service. King Frederick William III established military service in February, 1813. In Spring of 1813 two defeats were inflicted upon Prussian forces and a two month armistice followed (June-August, 1813). The author claims that in these two months the Army was doubled in size by the addition of new recruits and that the entire army was re-organized. Two months later was fought the Battle of Nations at Leipzig (October 16-19, 1813) which broke Napoleon's power and led to his downfall in the following year. It seems hardly possible that recruits hastily recruited and even more hastily trained could have defeated the Grand Army of Napoleon. Perhaps the *Krumper* system was not as ineffective as the author has concluded, and it is possible that many of the men called up for service in 1813 had had previous military training.

St. Louis University

ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI.

The French Railroads and The State, by Kimon A. Doukas. New York. Columbia University Press. 1945. pp. 287. \$3.50.

In 1937 the principal railroad lines in France were nationalized, thus bringing to an end a period of slightly over a century in which the railroads were privately owned and publicly subsidized. Throughout that time difficult problems beset the railroads—and at times upset them. The problem of national defense and of meeting

military needs always lurked in the background, and in time of crisis took precedence over economic, financial and cultural problems. At length, in 1937, the state took over the railroads, more with a view to integrating them than with the object of socializing them. The two years in which the new scheme worked was not sufficient time to show whether France had solved her railroad problems.

The story of the building and operating of the French railroads has never been told *in toto* in English. Dr. Doukas' work is therefore useful for bringing all the pieces of this story together and integrating them for the reader. The book is well organized, and it is full of factual material. The author is careful in drawing conclusions from his factual evidence; he maintains the position of a reporter of events rather than an interpreter. His reporting is rather sketchy, however, on the earlier part of the story; for he covers the period from 1823 to 1887 in thirty pages, and the period from 1887 to 1914 in forty more. The reorganization of 1921 and the nationalization of 1937 are given the extensive treatment they deserve.

St. Louis University

THOMAS P. NEILL.

The New Europe, An introduction to Its Political Geography, by Walter Fitzgerald. New York. Harper and Brothers. 1946. pp. xi + 298. \$2.75

The book is written in a scholarly manner; however, it contains much irrelevant detail since the author does not strictly adhere to subject matter which contributes to the politico-geographical setting suggested by the title, *The New Europe*.

In the first chapter, the concepts of the field of political geography are vaguely stated. No attempt is made to define the field. Strong in theory, but of admitted difficulty in their practical application, several possible solutions are suggested.

The second and third chapters are devoted to one of the great phenomena of past history,—the wanderings of the tribes and nations, and their ultimate settlement in various parts of Europe. The basic platform, the general terrain, and the climate are also given detailed consideration as environmental factors contributing to the early social, political, and economic development of these peoples. Much data on the relation of the European peoples to their natural environment is presented, and though scholarly written, the chapters contain much detail which is not pertinent to the problems confronting the political geographer in the "New Europe."

The book as a treatise in political geography might well begin with chapter four. The partition of Europe after World War I is soundly treated. The style of discourse becomes direct, free, and clear. Mackinder's idea of the Heartland; the idealistic principles underlying the attempt at compromise in the Treaty of Versailles; loss suffered by Germany, Austria, and Hungary after 1919 by frontier reduction; the creation of new polyglot countries; and the risk involved in the sudden accession of sovereignty by the new untried states—are highlights of this excellent chapter.

Chapter five deals with the Russian experiment in political geography. Although physical, climatic and

human factors are not favorable to the Russian federal plan, people of various races, nationalities, religious beliefs, and customs are becoming economically regimented and partially amalgamated. Therefore, we can well ask: do such anthropo-geographical factors as those listed early in the book apply to a strong country in pursuit of a vigorous policy? Certainly the Russians have not given them paramount consideration!

In the sixth chapter the current geographical problems of peninsular Europe are considered. The author indicates that he has a clear grasp of the prime factors of political geography. The major problem at the time of publication seemed to be the fair treatment of the German people without permitting their country to rise again as a strong military power. Other problems stated deal with loss of colonies by the vanquished, population trends, migration, and the desire for acquisition of additional key natural resources by the powers. The author observes that now is a time for enormous concentration of economic and political power within a few super-states. Small states must become the satellites of the "most friendly" large ones. England should strive for a new order,—for a federated Europe. But as to who should be the "guiding" countries in this suggested federation, he makes no comment.

In the final chapter, the author is concerned with Europe in its world relations. He mentions a "process of elimination of the contestants in the struggle" which presages further international conflict. Some Europeans, especially those in less favored areas, will migrate. Most of the peoples of northwestern Europe will remain there. Great Britain will continue to be the "guiding light" of backward peoples.

The selected bibliography following each chapter consists of timely, well-selected books.

St. Louis University

JOHN W. CONOYER

American History

Midwest At Noon, by Graham Hutton. Chicago. University of Chicago Press. 1946. pp. xv + 350. \$3.75

Periodically Americans are given the chance to find out how they appear in the eyes of Europeans. This latest addition to such literature avoids many pitfalls because its author limits himself to a definite section of the United States, the Midwest, which is understood as that area comprising the states of Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa and Missouri. Mr. Hutton admits in his foreword that he, an Englishman, is undertaking a difficult problem and that he realizes the necessity of proceeding warily.

Because he did proceed with caution, the author presents Midwesterners, and all Americans, with an excellent analysis of a region he contends will be of prime importance in settling the problems which confront a disrupted world. Mr. Hutton attacks his problem like a good doctor. He investigates the history of the case, and then deftly analyzes the component parts. This analysis includes a consideration of such important problems as the importance of weather in influencing many characteristics of the Midwesterners; the influence of the frontier in forming the habits of the people of this

section; and the difficulties involved in the conflicting interests of an urban and rural population.

Naturally the most important part of the analysis is that concerned with the people of the region. Mr. Hutton's ability shows up well in his handling of the many vexing problems, political, economic, social and religious which are inevitably bound up with any attempt to evaluate the character of a people. Realizing his position as an English onlooker, he is conscious of the fact that there will be many differences of opinion about his conclusions. In fact, some people of the region of which he writes will most likely be found in violent disagreement. But those who stand outside the region, as well as many fair minded people of the region itself, will admit that Mr. Hutton presents many thought provoking suggestions.

One would surmise that the author is extremely capable of presenting such an analysis of the Midwest. Governments generally endeavor to pick men to do work which they are capable of doing. Mr. Hutton spent five years in the Midwest as director of the Office of British Information. His task was, perhaps, rendered easier by the exigencies of the war; nevertheless, his task demanded that he learn all he could about the people whom he was to keep informed. The results of the contacts made in the performance of his duties are presented in this well written book, and it will help fair-minded Midwesterners to see themselves as they appear to a modern Englishman conscious of the problems which confront all peoples these days.

Some things will not appeal to the average Midwesterner who reads this book. For example, some will assert that the description of the extremes of climate in the area are a bit exaggerated. Many will wonder why any discussion of public opinion and the agencies which form and direct it in the Midwest does not include even a mention of the powerful *Chicago Tribune*. At times it seems that there is an assurance in conclusions which is not warranted by such a comparatively short time spent among a people so diverse in character and outlook. Without a doubt, though, this book is thought provoking and will be of great interest to those anxious to watch the changes that are inevitably coming over the people of all countries.

Regis College

H. L. STANSELL, S. J.

Brazil: People and Institutions, by T. Lynn Smith. Baton Rouge. Louisiana State University Press. 1946. pp. XXIV + 843. \$6.50

This work is not recommended for light reading, nor is it meant by its author to cater to the taste of the casual enthusiast. A cursory acquaintance with Brazil and Brazilians will be better sought in other books. This is a work of careful observation and painstaking research into Brazilian demography and social institutions. It is a scholar's handbook, packed with charts and tables, graphs and statistics, as becomes a study of this type.

The author first recalls to the reader's mind the "Cultural Diversity" of the Brazilian people, drawn from three and sometimes more racial stocks. He then passes on to study the people themselves, their standard of living, their relationship to the land. Finally, the institu-

tions of the people are set up for examination—domestic, religious, educational, governmental.

It is in his "Conclusion" that the author sets down some very interesting, helpful and penetrating observations, the fruits of the long years of study which went into the preparation of his work. These are pointed at Brazilians themselves, as well as at the "foreigner." He is willing to concur with the oft-repeated remark that "Brazil is the land of the future"; but his approval is not wholly uncritical and, certainly, not entirely unqualified. Brazil must do many things—improve medical and sanitary techniques, adopt to the fullest modern technology, revise her system of land apportionment, look to her system of distributing the fruits of production equitably, boost her cultural level, and so forth—if she is to realize her tremendous natural and human potentialities.

Serious students of Latin America should be thankful to Mr. Smith for his contribution to their fuller knowledge of one of the most important of the nations in the Other American family.

St. Louis University

JOHN F. BANNON, S. J.

Church History

Christianity's Problem in the Far East, by Andrew J. KRZESINSKI. Montreal. Fides Publishers. 1945. pp. 125. \$2.00

Father Krzesinski has written a very timely book. The war has made us Far Eastern-minded, and the future of Christianity in the changing Far Eastern world today is looked upon as a very important factor not just in the field of morality and religion, but also in the domain of economics, social reconstruction, and even politics. Furthermore, Christianity's problems in the Far East are Christianity's problems in nearly all foreign missions.

The author is quite convincing when he states that Christianity's major problem is in this that it just hasn't come to grips with the Far Eastern world. The reasons, on the side of the Far Easterners, are the strong religious traditions, the caste and family system, a growing nationalism, and the widespread ignorance of Christianity. The causes for the retarded progress on the part of the Westerners, on the other hand, are the lack of unity among Christians, the non-Christian conduct and attitude of Western Christians, the fact that Christianity creates the suspicion of being an exclusively Western religion which is thought to contribute to the maintenance of European domination, and finally the lack of contact with the native cultures and the native educated classes, especially on the part of Catholic colleges and universities.

In listing the above mentioned causes, the author states deplorable but well-known facts. What we would like to know are the reasons which underlie these facts. These the author unfortunately fails to include in his study.

Of course, the lack of unity among Christians needs no further explanation. And for the non-Christian "Christianity" of the majority of our so-called Christian countries—perhaps a more serious setback for the missions than even the pagan religions are—the home front

is to be blamed, not the missions. But what about the other deficiencies and missed opportunities of which the author rightly makes so much? The reviewer is inclined to think that they can all be reduced to one common cause: the lack of proper understanding of, and appreciation for, the Far Eastern civilizations and their traditional cultural values. The missionary methods for centuries have been characterized by an unduly strong and sometimes narrow-minded Europeanism that had little or no use for anything not European. Far Eastern philosophy, mysticism, literature, art, and the like, did not find the attention they deserve. They were hardly, if ever, used as a stepping stone to the true faith. The perhaps hidden, yet extant, values in religious traditions, family concept, and ancestral rites, to mention just a few examples, were totally disregarded, and it is for this reason mainly that the missionaries did not, and could not, have the contact with the native cultures and educated classes which is so essential.

Today powerful reactionary forces are at work in the Orient. They are endeavoring to bring the genuine spirit of the East back into its own and purge its cultural expressions of all the foreign trappings that have accumulated since the close interrelation with the West began. They still welcome the material achievements of our civilization. They are still eager to learn. But what they want is a synthesis of Western intellectual and material attainments with the sacred heritage of their own cultural past. This will demand a great deal of study and understanding on the part of the missionary; and it will also demand that Catholics both at home and abroad humbly realize that however great certain Western forms of Christian culture are, they are not necessarily of universal value. The Church, in order to be "all things to all men" (I Cor. 9:22), can and must adapt herself to the particular genius and culture of the nation she evangelizes.

Sophia University, Tokyo

GUSTAV VOSS, S. J.

Hallowed Were the Gold Dust Trails, The Story of the Pioneer Priests of Northern California, by Henry L. Walsh, S. J. Santa Clara. University of Santa Clara Press. 1946. pp. xii + 559.

When Bishop Robert J. Armstrong of the Sacramento diocese in California sent a copy of this volume to every Ordinary in the United States, he did more than purvey an account of the history of his own diocese. Not that the ecclesiastical story of his portion of the vineyard is not contained within these pages—for it is in satisfying fashion, indeed: but both the genial Ordinary of Sacramento and the author of this book early realized that it would be bound to have a well nigh universal appeal. Is there a student of the American past who has never thrilled to the saga of the Mother Lode country? Can anyone with a solid affection for the American story fail to be interested in the "days of old, the days of gold, the days of '49?" In the words of the author: "The unique era known as the 'Gold Rush Days' has been carefully prospected by the historians of the past, patiently dug up, winnowed and panned, placered and dredged, until the fund of likely material has been well nigh exhausted; and yet, as we shall see,

there still remain some flashes of 'color', as the miners say, which have not been detected, and which cannot be passed over, if the history of El Dorado is to be completely told and justly appreciated. The 'color' in question is the modest, yet powerful influence of the Catholic Church, whose uninterrupted course of existence throughout that glamorous era is suffused with much of the romantic glow of the Gold Rush itself . . ."

Commonly, and with reason, historians are innately suspicious of that romantic approach to the past which belongs to the prerogatives of poetry; however, in the present instance, it does for once seem fortunate that the sacerdotal saga of Northern California has been told by an acknowledged bard. Father Walsh has sung many a song in poetic measure these many years; the touch of the poet is not absent from any of the pages of this volume. The author is not a trained historian in the technical sense of the term; but this is not to say that his work has not been built upon the solid foundation of archival research and ransacking of all available records. The 284 notes to the text—some of them of considerable length,—plus the 30 pages of supplementary information given in an appendix, give this account a well deserved air of authenticity. Years were spent collecting material, and hardly a spot in the entire Gold Rush country was left unvisited by Father Walsh in his determination to second the words of Bishop Armstrong speaking of the priestly pioneers who sowed what he has been called to reap: "The story of their lives should never die."

Within these pages are really two narratives; one, of larger interest (as we have already noted) is the romantic and undying account of the discovery of gold and what followed upon that event; the other, will have a more limited appeal, at least in some of its details. This is the quite thorough account of the Catholic origins and progress in each of the many countries. But, even here, interest is saved by interlarding many a rousing anecdote and story which one would not have liked to miss: many of them, one suspects, came to the author from the lips of pioneers, both clerical and lay. They are chatty and colorful in the extreme.

Rev. Terence O'Connor, S. J., deserves praise for sketch portraits of the pioneer bishops and for maps of the various county mines; material assistance would have been given the reader, though, if a sketch map of the various geographical divisions of the entire northern section of California had been added. One not acquainted with the Golden State might thus avoid confusion in localizing the narrative.

University of San Francisco JOHN B. MCGLOIN, S. J.

Major Trends in American Church History, by Francis X. Curran, S. J. New York. The America Press. 1946. pp. XVIII + 198. \$2.50

Strange that this book was not written long ago. Hitherto our works of Catholic American history kept step, chapter by chapter, with the movements of our national political history. In the book before us, there is nothing remotely political. The background is the Protestant world of confusion. We here have the Church and the churches. At long last we have a Catholic

analysis of the variegated types of American dissident opinions of Divine Truth.

The feature of the book that has attracted the attention of all critics is—what seems impossible in exact writing—the ease of expression that makes the perusal rather a recreation than a study. This quality is maintained, not merely in hurrying over the Spanish and French regimes of American colonization, where seen in a bird's eye view from afar, the little ups and downs of life vanish from the terrain and only the large and permanent, the heroic and saintly appear; but astonishingly this facile intelligibility continues on through what might seem a bewildering series of rebellions of one Protestant church from a parent organization, fissiparous endlessly until the vital spark of real Christianity is practically extinguished.

But the work is not perfect. We might suggest some trifling alterations. On page 79, Nauvoo should be located in Illinois, not Missouri; at page 23, Anthony Montesinos, O. P. should replace Alphonso Sandoval; at page 6 when meeting Calvin and what was Calvinism the author should improve his objectivity; and at p. 148 an exception should be made in favor of the Lutherans in the strong opening sentences on "The End of Protestant Creeds."

St. Louis University

LAURENCE KENNY, S. J.

Social Science

Systematic Politics, by Charles E. Merriam. Chicago. University of Chicago Press. 1945. pp. xiii + 349. \$3.75

If it were possible to conceive of a survey course in political science at the graduate level, the ideal text book for such a course would undoubtedly be Professor Merriam's "Systematic Politics." This book represents the summing-up of Dr. Merriam's practical and theoretical knowledge of the fundamentals of government. One might confidently expect that a political scientist with Merriam's long and varied background of research, teaching and practical experience in the field, would produce an unusually penetrating book. *Systematic Politics* offers complete justification for such an expectation.

Throughout, there is displayed a freshness and a depth of thought that are very rare in general analytical works of this type. The opening chapters present a brilliant though relatively brief treatment of the roots of government, to be found in human nature as conditioned by the external environment in which it must develop. But determinism of every sort, racial, geographical, economic or material, is rejected. "We observe the growing genius for human cooperation in satisfying the genuine needs of man, through means adapted to his nature, and ends appropriate to his high destiny." The common good, as defined by Mr. Merriam, includes five elements: external security, internal order, justice, general welfare and freedom. Its maintenance is the specific function of political authority. What of sovereignty?

Sovereignty is self-interpreting and self-determining within the borders of what is recognized as the current legal or political order; but there are other orders and values. Authority may define its

own rules and regulations with precision and finality, but their decisionism is not final or precise socially unless it is acceptable to the society. . . . It is within this . . . framework of libertarian political institutions, of scientific certitudes, of moral and religious values, that emerging sovereignty must operate if it is to function usefully in a political society. Reason, not force, is to be its milieu.

The tools which government uses, and which are or may be used as well by other social groups, are classified as follows: custom, violence or force, symbolism, rational consent, strategy, leadership, and the special skills of special groups. Here is a healthy recognition that the state does not rest solely on force for its effectiveness, nor yet wholly on ideals either. In considering the organs of government, the author abandons the outworn and now generally meaningless classification of legislative, executive and judicial, and offers in its place a grouping into (1) organs of headship, found in every government, (2) executive organs, (3) organs of adjudication, (4) organs of conciliar type, whether having full legislative authority or not, and (5) managerial organs. This analysis, along with that of the factors involved in the stability of government, comprises, in the reviewer's opinion, the best part of an altogether fine book.

No summary of this book can do more than suggest its real value to the advanced student of government. It is not a book for freshmen, though even these lowly creatures might derive great benefit from its study. But the breadth and the depth of its scope are such that it could be fully appreciated only by the student who had already, out of his own study and experience, acquired some degree of breadth and depth of his own. For this latter, *Systematic Politics* is indeed a "must." *St. Louis University* PAUL G. STEINBICKER.

Book Notices

A Diplomatic History of the American People, by Thomas A. Bailey. New York. F. S. Crofts & Company. Third Edition, 1946. pp. xxvi + 937. \$4.25

This book which in the past six years has established itself as one of the finest studies of American diplomacy needs neither introduction nor review. Suffice it to note that the author has added two new chapters on the diplomacy of World War II to the previous edition, and made a few minor changes, always in the interest of greater thoroughness and serviceability. A diplomatic history must be kept up to date. This the author has done with his characteristic skill and scholarship.

A History of Europe, by Ferdinand Shevill. New York. Harcourt, Brace and Company. 1946. pp. xi + 937. \$4.75

This new and revised edition of Shevill's well known text carries the story of European history through the Second World War. In the light of recent happenings, Professor Shevill has revised and enlarged his treatment of the Nineteenth Century and the period between the two World Wars. The only other noticeable change is his more thorough—and better—treatment of cultural changes in modern European history.

Theory and Practice in Historical Study: A report of the Committee on Historiography. New York. Social Science Research Council, Bulletin 54. 1946. pp. xi + 177. \$1.75

The Committee on Historiography of the Social Science Research Council has attempted, in this report, "to help clarify thought about history and to aid historians in teaching and writing it." To this end, it has presented five essays and a bibliography on historiography and the philosophy of history. In the first essay, Charles Beard presents "grounds for a reconsideration" of the nature of history and of its role in contemporary civilization. In this essay Professor Beard shows the confusion attendant upon the nature and scope of history, its relation to the other social sciences, and the terms employed by writers of history.

The second essay, by John Herman Randall, Jr., and George Haines, is a discussion of "Controlling Assumptions in the Practice of American Historians." This is perhaps the most valuable section of the committee's report, offering, as it does, a brilliant sketch of the history of American history writing. The third essay is a case study in "causality in history"—an analysis of what historians have said about the causes of the Civil War. The fourth essay, on the problem of terminology in historical writing, shows the need for greater precision in the use of historical terms and illustrations. The final section consists of a list of propositions that the committee thinks should guide writers and teachers of history today.

The report is valuable as a stimulus for those who wish to pause, in the course of their teaching, to check upon themselves, to reconsider the nature of their subject and the meaning of the terms they constantly use. The report should prove useful to the graduate student for his work on historiography and the philosophy of history. *St. Louis University* THOMAS P. NEILL.

THE MODERN SCHOOLMAN

presents ~

for the

- MODERN THINKER
- the true
- PHILOSOPHY
- of the
- SCHOOLMEN

PUBLISHED AT
ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

2.00 PER YEAR
50c PER COPY

SAMPLE COPY
ON REQUEST